

# **Approaches to Assessing Violence Among Youth**

by Nicholas Minogue, Paul Kingery, and Lisa Murphy

April 15, 1999

The Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence  
1925 North Lynn Street, Suite 305  
Rosslyn, VA 22209  
(703) 527-4217  
[www.hjni.gsehd.gwu.edu](http://www.hjni.gsehd.gwu.edu)

Prepared under Grant No. 97-MU-FX-KO12 (S-1) from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the Institute and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

# **Approaches to Assessing Violence Among Youth**

by Nicholas Minogue, Paul Kingery, and Lisa Murphy

## ***ABSTRACT***

This document is a compendium of surveys, instruments, and other approaches that have been used to assess youth violence and closely related phenomena. Techniques for assessments in this field have changed significantly over the years, so an updated compendium of this sort is needed. A broad range of assessments of the phenomena of greatest interest to those involved in preventing youth violence is presented.

Part A appraises the critical concepts of building collaboration among consortium members, identifying the strategies already used in researching youth violence, using archival data, conducting a needs assessment, matching the data collection to the stage of the violence prevention program, combining quantitative and qualitative data, timing the assessment, resolving the ethical dilemmas that arise when doing this important research, and identifying risk and protective factors for violence. A typology of constructs and items of interest to those charged with violence prevention is presented as a distilled summary of what is presented in many different forms in Part B.

Part B examines specific assessments. This section is separated into several subsections, which include assessments of youth violence and closely related phenomena from diverse points of view: (1) teacher perceptions, (2) parent perceptions, (3) perceptions of school counselors and psychologists, (4) student self-reports of their violent behaviors and victimization experiences, (5) student peer nominations, and (6) aspects of community environments.

For each assessment presented in this document, information is included about who developed the assessment tool or procedure, where additional reliability and validity information is located, appropriate ages of subjects for the assessment, how to complete the assessment and its survey response options, scoring, a description of the assessment, its properties, and how to order associated materials.

# **Approaches to Assessing Violence Among Youth**

by Nicholas Minogue, Paul Kingery, and Lisa Murphy

## **Introduction**

- A. The Role of Assessment in Violence Prevention
- B. Methods Used To Identify Measures
- C. Organization of the Document

## **Part A. Key Issues for Assessment in Violence Prevention Efforts**

### **I. Getting Started**

- Formation of Partnerships
- Identification of Strategies Already in Place
- Initial Assessment of Problems Using Archival Data
- Data Collection Systems
- Needs Assessment
- Formative and Summative Approaches to Data Collection
- Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches to Measurement
- The Importance of Timing
- Use of Control or Comparison Groups
- Identification of Risk and Protective Factors

### **II. Indicators of Factors Linked to School Violence**

- Community Characteristics
- Family Characteristics
- School Climate
- Substance Involvement
- Student Engagement at School
- Occurrences That Instigate Violence
- Attitudes Favoring Violence
- Weapons Possession at School or on the School Grounds

### **III. Youth Violence Perpetration or Victimization**

- Common Violence
- Inventive Violence
- Severe Menacing
- Menacing Verbal or Body Language

- Impulsive Violence
- Less Extreme Sexual Assaults
- Extreme Violence
- Violence Against Authority Figures

IV. Witnessing Violence

- Witnessing Extreme Violence

V. Outcomes

- Administrative Outcomes
- Criminal Justice Outcomes
- Broader Repercussions

**Part B. Survey Instruments**

- I. Teacher Ratings of the Violent Behavior of Students
  - Aggression Behavior-Teacher Checklist
  - Children's Behavior Questionnaire
  - National School Crime and Safety Survey: Staff Form
  - New York Teachers Ratings Scale
  - School Social Behavior Scale
  - School Behavior Checklist
  - Social Behavior Questionnaire
- II. Parent Ratings of Aggressive and Violent Behavior of Their Children
  - Behavior Assessment System for Children: Parent Ratings Scale
  - Child Behavior Checklist: Parent Form
  - Conners' Parent Ratings Scale
  - Personality Inventory for Children
  - Preschool & Kindergarten Behavior Scale
  - Revised Louisville Behavior Checklist
  - Self-Control Ratings Scale
- III. Measures for School Counselors and Psychologists
  - Fears and Worries Student Questionnaire
  - The Hopelessness Scale for Children
  - Preschool Behavior Questionnaire
  - Wisconsin Aggression Behavior in Schools Survey
- IV. Student Self-Reports of Violence, Aggression, and Anger
  - Adolescent Violence Survey
  - The Aggression Inventory
  - The Aggression Questionnaire
  - Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory

Multidimensional Anger Inventory  
Multidimensional School Anger Inventory  
Personality Inventory for Youth  
Social Skills Rating System  
State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory  
Weinberger Adjustment Inventory  
Youth Risk Behavior Survey

- V. Peer Nominations of Violence and Aggression
  - Peer Nomination Inventory
  - Pupil Evaluation Inventory
- VI. Weapons
  - Attitudes Toward Guns and Violence Questionnaire
  - Tulane University National Youth Study
- VII. Measures of Community Violence
  - The Children's Exposure to Community Violence Survey
  - The Children's Report of Exposure to Violence
- VIII. School and Community Risk Factors
  - MacArthur Neighborhood Study
  - The Oregon School Safety Survey
- IX. Measurements of Gangs and Attitudes Toward Gangs
  - Attitudes Toward Gangs
  - National Youth Gang Survey
- X. Measures of Relationship Violence
  - Acceptance of Couple Violence
  - Perpetration in Dating Relationships
  - Victimization in Dating Relationships

Appendix A  
References

# Introduction

## **The Role of Assessment in Violence Prevention**

While most people agree that violence in schools is a problem, merely recognizing the problem's existence leaves many questions unanswered. How widespread a problem is school violence? What is the nature of the problem? Is school violence increasing or decreasing over time? What are its causes? Who is most at risk for different types of violence and why? What types of problems result from violence in the schools? How are these problems and the solutions to school violence perceived by various members of the community? What strategies are effective for preventing violence, and which are most effective? What is the best mix of prevention strategies and how much effect can they have? School officials and those involved in education have vital decisions to make on the basis of the answers to these questions, and all community members want to find solutions to the problem of violence in the schools.

The approaches to assessment in the field of violence prevention should be as precise as possible, given the complexities of human thought and action. This compendium presents information about many types of assessment tools, such as student self-reports, peer ratings, and observations by parents and teachers. Some assessments are rather simple, while others are highly complex. Generally, using a mix of assessments from different perspectives leads to the best information.

The role of assessment in violence prevention is a multifaceted one. The instruments discussed in this document can be used to measure the violence-related behavior of individual students, multiple classes of students, whole schools, and in some cases, entire school districts. These instruments can be used to conduct an initial needs assessment of violence-related behavior and attitudes at a school, so that administrators will be able to choose the violence prevention initiative that best suits the needs of their student population. They can be used to conduct research on risk and protective factors for specific types of violence. Research on specific risk and protective factors is important to violence prevention because it allows identification of students who may be at risk for violence or other problem behaviors. Once research on risk and protective factors becomes better established, more effective and efficient interventions can be developed to address specific risk factors. Many of the assessment tools in this compendium are also useful for measuring the effectiveness of violence prevention programs implemented in schools across the country. Violence prevention programs can be evaluated on a periodic basis to assess progress toward achieving their goals and objectives. Evaluators can then use the results to refine, improve, and strengthen the intervention.

## **Methods Used To Identify Measures**

The following electronic bibliographic databases were searched using root forms of key terms such as school, violence, aggression, youth, adolescence, children, assessment,

measurement, evaluation, research, and others:

ArticleFirst (Article1st)  
Dissertation Abstracts (DissAbs)  
ERIC  
ERIC/AE Test Locator  
ETS Test File  
The Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan (ISR)  
MedLine  
Psychological Assessment Resources Incorporated (PAR)  
PRO-ED  
PSYB  
PSYJ  
Sociological Abstracts (SocioAbs)  
Social Science Abstracts (SocSciAbs)  
Western Psychological Services  
WorldCat  
WRLC Libraries Catalog

The citations, abstracts, and descriptions were downloaded and inserted through EndLink to EndNote2 using filter programs written by the second author. Copies of articles were obtained, and their text and reference lists were checked for further instruments and citations on the psychometric properties of instruments. Authors of instruments and/or their distribution agents or copyright holders were contacted to obtain copies of instruments not fully presented in the articles and to obtain permission for their inclusion in this document. Secondary searches of the bibliographic databases were conducted using the name of the instruments located or the names of their authors to identify additional citations of articles containing psychometric information. The language used in this document is heavily dependent on the descriptions provided by these sources, although the sources are not directly quoted.

Instruments included in this document were chosen according to specific criteria. There are dozens of instruments that attempt to measure the violent, hostile, angry, or aggressive behavior of children, but some are better at it than others. The better instruments have good test-retest reliability and high internal consistency, have been administered for several years, and have been evaluated by third parties to assess reliability and validity.

New instruments will be added to this document periodically. Updates will be made to the Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence Internet site ([www.hfni.gsehd.gwu.edu](http://www.hfni.gsehd.gwu.edu)) as new instruments come to the authors' attention. Authors of instruments not included in this document are encouraged to send their instruments to the Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence (1925 N. Lynn Street, #305, Rosslyn, VA 22209) so they can be considered for the next edition of this document.

## **Organization of the Document**

This compendium of approaches to measuring violence and closely related phenomena among youth is presented in two sections. Part A discusses the key issues involved in the assessment of youth violence and various factors linked to violence, and lists component elements identified in various instruments. Researchers can use this list to develop new approaches or instruments that more thoroughly measure each construct of interest.

Part B presents the individual approaches or instruments identified in the literature that match as closely as possible the key issues identified by scientists and practitioners. These are organized in subsections based on the person who provides the information (e.g., parent, teacher, administrator, counselor, peer, self, or a combination).

The approaches or instruments are described in detail by listing the following types of information:

- Author(s) and original citation
- Secondary citations and revisions
- Age groups for which the assessment is appropriate
- Descriptions of the elements or items included in the assessment
- Scales and subscales included in the instrument
- Instructions for administering the assessment
- Options for coding the responses
- Scoring methods
- Reliability and validity of scales
- Cost of the instrument and whether it is available for purchase
- Qualifications for persons administering and interpreting the instrument
- Contact information

The instruments presented in this compendium are a preliminary overview of the many instruments that measure youth crime, violence, and other antisocial attitudes and behaviors. There are dozens of other such instruments that measure these behaviors that have not been included in this document. As the staff of the Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence further evaluates these instruments, some will be incorporated into future drafts of this compendium. For a more comprehensive list of instruments that measure violence-related attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of youth, please refer to appendix A.

The instruments referred to in the body of this document have somewhat uneven supporting documentation (psychometric properties, citations, cost, and other elements in the list above). As instrument authors proceed with their research, their new findings and resources will be added to subsequent drafts of this compendium.

## **Part A. Key Issues for Assessment in Violence**

# **Prevention Efforts**

## **I. Getting Started**

Assessing violence is not a simple task, and several issues must be addressed. One of the first steps is to foster communitywide collaboration to ensure that everyone is involved who needs to be. In addition, the purpose of the assessment must be clear. Sometimes, an assessment is undertaken to establish the prevention needs of a population. The instruments discussed here can also be used to identify risk and protective factors and to evaluate violence prevention programs and strategies. If preventing violence is the goal, strategies that are already in place should be identified before implementing and evaluating new ones. Assessments of how well a strategy is working require one approach, while assessments of the outcomes of a strategy require another. The approach can include both qualitative methods (usually involving intensive observations and unstructured interviews or discussions with participants) and quantitative methods (usually involving observational coding systems, surveys, and self-report instruments). Timing is important for gathering meaningful information. The effectiveness of the strategy for reducing violence can only be assessed with multiple measures using both treatment and control groups.

### **Formation of Partnerships**

Those who are interested in assessing violence probably have a population in mind and at least a rough idea of the types of problems they face. Parents, teachers, school administrators, school counselors, researchers, and others must first compare their own perceptions with the perceptions of others who will be involved in seeking, planning, implementing, evaluating, or receiving interventions. All stakeholders do not necessarily have to agree completely, but some common ground should be sought. Discussions with the early joiners will lead to the identification of additional people to be included. Giving people the opportunity to voice important issues in small informal groups is a good way to bring the key concerns to the broader group for discussion with less intensity. With strong and appropriate leadership, the group can move quickly toward developing normative understandings, plans for proceeding, and goals to be achieved.

### **Identification of Strategies Already in Place**

New efforts sometimes build on older ones. The merits of the strategies already in place should never be discounted even though the problems persist. Inviting early innovators to the table is important because they have very useful information from real experience to contribute. They can be the instructors in the early phase of planning, and time allocated to this learning process will be fruitful. These people perhaps have hard data from their interventions as well as intuitive insights to contribute. Once the early innovators are absorbed into the process of

bringing additional resources to bear on the problems, they will begin to be influenced by the normative structures within the broader group.

## **Initial Assessment of Problems Using Archival Data**

The approaches discussed in this document are useful in collecting new data on violence problems. The appropriate starting place, however, is to examine the types of data already being collected, or that have been collected in the past, for the population of interest. Finding the data is often a difficult process, and gaining access to the data in usable formats is sometimes even more difficult, if not impossible.

Data are often protected from misuse. Personal identifiers are sometimes attached to data, and a “public use” data set, stripped of all identifiers, may or may not be available. Data on illegal violent behaviors are often held by agencies involved in the investigation and prosecution of the illegal behavior, and releasing information could compromise investigations or violate protections provided to individuals under the law. Some data on violent behavior are attached to child abuse data within social service agencies or to academic data within schools. The costs and the time required to strip data of identifiers are often beyond the capacity or budget restrictions of the agency holding the data.

## **Data Collection Systems**

Quantifying the disruptive and violent behavior of students is a vital element of any school violence prevention effort. Incident reporting systems allow school officials a systematic means to monitor the types of crime and violence being committed on their campuses, who the perpetrators and victims of violence are, the time and location, seasonal trends, and many other important factors.

Presently, there are no national requirements or guidelines for schools to follow as they develop systems to record the disruptive and violent behavior of their students. At the state and local level, schools administrators and legislators have been taking the initiative in creating a variety of data collection systems. Unfortunately, there is little uniformity among these systems and they vary greatly in sophistication and quality making it difficult to compare data from state to state or even from school to school. In 1995, the National Forum on Education Statistics established a Crime, Violence and Discipline Task Force to create a recommended model of definitions and protocol for the collection of crime and violence data in an effort to promote comparability and uniformity in collections across the nation. The following are some of the recommendations made by the Task Force:

- All data that are collected should be based on the school year.
- All disruptive and violent incidents that occur on school grounds, on school transportation, or at off-campus school sponsored events should be recorded.
- Any incident with the presence of alcohol, drugs, or weapons should be recorded.
- Report any incidents with multiple infractions.
- All incidents in which a gang was involved should be recorded
- Hate-crime motivated incidents should be recorded.
- Identification of the victim and perpetrator to determine who was involved in the incident.

- Incidents reported to law enforcement agencies should be recorded.
- Describe any weapon used to commit an offense.
- If school property was vandalized, the monetary value of the damaged property should be recorded.
- Record the punishment administered to the perpetrator.

Perhaps the only commercially available incident reporting systems is GBA Systems' School Safety Program (SSP2000). The SSP2000 meets or exceeds most of the recommendations made by the National Forum on Education Statistics with its ability to collect, report, and analyze incidents of crime and violence at school. This software can be used by an individual school, school district, or at the state level. Additionally, it can be tailored to meet the needs of any particular school context. For product information, GBA Systems can be contacted at the following address: 8818 US Hwy 421 North; Colfax, NC 27235; 1-(800) 422-3267; [www.gbasy.com](http://www.gbasy.com).

### **Needs Assessment**

Often school administrators and staff, students, parents, and community members all have different perceptions of school violence and crime. These perceptions are not always accurate, and a review of archival data will not necessarily give a complete picture of students' violent behaviors and attitudes. In order to get the fullest picture of students' violence-related attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs, so that violence prevention interventions can address the most pressing needs at the school and have the greatest impact on the student population, researchers should conduct an initial needs assessment. A needs assessment, coupled with a review of archival data, will allow school administrators to identify the most serious forms of violence on campus, which groups of students are more likely to be victims or perpetrators of violence, and many other factors. Once this information has been analyzed, school administrators can choose the violence prevention initiative that best suits the needs of their students.

### **Formative and Summative Approaches to Data Collection**

Particularly in the early phases of an intervention, a formative approach to data collection is useful in making improvements along the way. Evaluators use formative approaches to assess the intervention's processes and interim impacts. An assessment of the types and amounts of exposure to the intervention among participants reveals the true inputs of the intervention, which can differ from the intervention plan. An assessment of the types and amounts of involvement of key service providers is useful in gauging the adoption and diffusion of the intervention. Studying the ways in which the intervention is adopted is useful in finding ways to streamline the processes used to create change. Assessing the interim impacts and the nature of the experience as perceived by the participants and providers is a useful avenue to understanding the process and altering it as needed to make it more acceptable and more effective.

A summative approach is used once the intervention is somewhat mature to gauge its effect on the participants. The emphasis is more on the "bottom line," although assessment of the way in which the ultimate changes were achieved is also important. All of the effects of an

intervention cannot be measured in a short period of time. Some of the benefits of the intervention can occur later, or they can be of a nature that is difficult to measure. Interventions that can be shown to produce effects of a large magnitude for a moderate cost are in great demand.

### **Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches to Measurement**

Qualitative approaches, such as focus groups, naturalistic observations, and unstructured interviews, can be used to assess all aspects of an intervention. They focus more on what happens during an intervention, exploring many avenues of inquiry. Such approaches often lead to clearer insights into the broader experiences of the intervention participants than highly structured approaches. Once the information from the qualitative approach is gleaned, researchers will then have a clearer idea about what to measure in larger samples using such quantitative measures as surveys, incident monitoring, and tests that assess “how much” and “how often” a certain phenomenon occurs. New questions raised through quantitative research can be addressed through qualitative approaches that probe the issues more deeply. In some cases a single assessment approach will include elements of both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

### **The Importance of Timing**

Timing is important in the assessment of problems and intervention effects. Using data that are several years old in assessing problems can fail to identify current problems. Factors are usually measured before and after an intervention so they can be compared. If the initial measurement is taken after an intervention is under way, changes could already have occurred that will not be captured in the comparison. If the final measurement is too early, it could miss changes that will occur later. In human behavioral studies, researchers generally expect that participation in the intervention occurs first, followed in time by (1) changes in attitudes, beliefs, and values, (2) changes in skills, (3) changes in behavior, or (4) a combination of two or more of these regardless of their sequence. In general, the time interval between preintervention and postintervention measures should be equivalent to the time required for the type of change expected to occur. Violence seems to increase just before holidays or summer recess. Data gathered at such times are not comparable with data gathered at other times.

### **Use of Control or Comparison Groups**

When measuring intervention effects, one must be aware that changes from before to after the intervention can occur for reasons other than intervention effects. Researchers usually measure phenomena that are constantly fluctuating in relation to a variety of causes. Using a control group (receiving no intervention) or a comparison group (receiving an alternate intervention), researchers can determine whether the intervention was more effective than no intervention or an alternate intervention. Because nonintervention causes of change are expected to be similar in the primary intervention group and in the comparison group, differential effects in the two groups are attributable to differences in the two interventions. Six types of intervention successes can be observed using pre- and post- assessments in an intervention group and a comparison or control group:

1. An undesirable phenomenon is increasing in the comparison or control group but remains stable from pretest to posttest in the intervention group.
2. An undesirable phenomenon is stable in the comparison or control group but decreases from pretest to posttest in the intervention group.
3. An undesirable phenomenon is decreasing faster in the intervention group than in the comparison or control group.
4. A desirable phenomenon is decreasing in the comparison or control group but remains stable from pretest to posttest in the intervention group.
5. A desirable phenomenon is stable in the comparison or control group but increases from pretest to posttest in the intervention group.
6. A desirable phenomenon is increasing faster in the intervention group than in the comparison or control group.

Without measuring the phenomenon of interest in a comparison or control group researchers have difficulty determining whether the intervention or other factors caused whatever changes are observed. Without control or comparison groups, researchers would have to monitor all other factors in the community, family, and school that could affect observed changes to judge whether a given intervention is primarily responsible for the observed changes. This is impossible to do because one can never be sure all the other factors have been monitored.

Some argue that withholding an intervention from students on a large scale is unethical. Others argue that implementing an intervention without knowing its effects is unethical. Both points of view have merit, but the only solution is selective implementation of interventions and careful evaluation. If the issue is that providing a service to one group in close proximity to another group that does not receive the service is unfair, one must equally question whether the processes that exclude others from proximity to those two groups is unfair. Why give an intervention in one school and not another? Why give only that one intervention when many others could be added to produce a greater effect? Why work to solve one problem when you leave other problems unsolved? The point is, violence prevention has to start somewhere, and no service delivery system is fully fair. In addition, there is no assurance that an innovative intervention will work, and many ultimately prove not to be very effective. A partial solution to this dilemma is to offer the intervention to the control or comparison group after the first intervention group has received it (commonly called a “wait-list” comparison).

## **Identification of Risk and Protective Factors**

In order to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of violence prevention initiatives, more research needs to be done on risk and protective factors for specific types of violence. There

are many different types of violence; it is not a uniform phenomenon. Different types of violence perhaps have similar risk factors, but those factors are likely to have different levels of importance for different types of violence. Although risk factors can be used to identify troubled youth, some factors may or may not be causes of problem behavior. Therefore, risk factors should not be used as a basis for diagnosing or labeling children. However, they can be used as an early warning to identify students who could be at risk for violence or other problem behaviors. Risk factors are best used by practitioners in making referrals for a continuum of services both at school and in the broader community. For developers of violence intervention programs these factors are especially useful in creating effective and cost-efficient interventions. And for policymakers, risk factors are best used as a means of assessing the applicability of a program to a particular group. Once research on risk and protective factor becomes better established, more effective and efficient interventions can then be chosen to address specific risk factors. Additionally, a good match between programs and referred youth can be established by screening youth for risk factors.

## **II. Indicators of Factors Linked to School Violence**

Many factors are linked to violence. Some of these are direct or indirect causes of violence, while others are phenomena that happen to occur in the same people without true causal connections. Some of the factors commonly linked to violence include the characteristics of the community and family, the school climate, substance involvement, the lack of engagement of youth in school activities, trigger events that lead to violent responses, attitudes favoring violence, and weapon possession. Some factors promote violence while others prevent it. These are the factors measured in one form or another by the instruments listed in Part B.

### **Community Characteristics**

Unemployment and underemployment of adults and youth in the broader community  
Involvement of youth in violence in the broader community (perpetration and victimization)  
Involvement of youth in drug trafficking in the broader community  
Involvement of youth in gangs in the broader community  
Presence of “broken windows” (that is, homelessness, overcrowding, disorder, deteriorating infrastructure)

### **Family Characteristics**

Absence of parent (father or mother) from the home  
Family poverty  
Parents’ education  
Means of resolving conflicts within families  
Effective discipline within the family  
Constructive parental involvement in school disciplinary infractions  
Parental support of appropriate school discipline policies  
Parental support of appropriate school discipline efforts  
Parental substance abuse  
Parental criminal activities or involvement with the justice system  
Presence of supportive extended family  
Sibling criminal activities or involvement with the justice system  
Sibling substance abuse  
Family involvement with community groups (religious institutions, community centers, youth groups)

### **School Climate**

Safe and secure school environment  
Consistent and fair enforcement of school rules  
Consequences, penalties, and punishments appropriate to infractions  
Provision of due process with consistency  
Teamwork in disciplinary processes  
Degree to which students are insulted or humiliated by school teachers or administrators

Consistent reporting of infractions  
Adequate training for staff  
Parent support and involvement  
Clear and frequent communication of school disciplinary code  
Student belief that teachers and administrators care about them

### **Substance Involvement**

Prevalence, frequency, and incidence of substance abuse  
Drug trafficking in schools and student involvement in drug trafficking in the community  
Possession of prohibited substances in schools

### **Student Engagement at School**

Desire to do well or improve academically  
Extent of student alienation  
Involvement in extracurricular activities (sports, drama, community service)  
Student participation in school government and policymaking  
Desire to gain specific skills for future plans (either college or vocation)

### **Occurrences That Instigate Violence**

Recent abuse  
Recent victimization  
Recent hassling or shoving  
Fight picked or started by another person  
Attempt by another person to boss him or her around  
Unfairness  
Someone cuts in front of him or her in line  
Criticism  
Insult  
Insult to a friend in his or her presence  
Insult to a family member  
Disrespect  
Meanness  
Annoyance  
Bullying  
Teasing or making fun of  
Bossiness  
Rumors spread by another person about subject or someone subject cares about  
Interpretation of a neutral interaction as negative  
Dare to other children to do things  
Picking on someone he or she cares about by another person  
Insulting someone he or she cares about by another person  
Desire to fight with him or her on the part of another person

Name-calling  
Theft of something from him or her  
Flirtation with someone he or she likes  
Purposeful destruction of his or her property  
Hurting someone he or she cares about  
Not liking someone

### **Attitudes Favoring Violence**

Admiring people who know how to fight with their fists (no weapon)  
Admiring people who know how to fight with weapons  
Believing people should defend themselves or those they care about at all costs  
Believing that not defending oneself shows cowardice  
Believing that fighting is the only way to defend oneself or those one cares about  
Believing that involving adults in a dispute will make matters worse  
Believing one must aggress to establish the expectation that one will fight when necessary  
Believing fighting will impress others  
Thinking fighting makes one important or powerful  
Enjoying fighting and/or hurting others  
Believing that fighting has no negative consequences

### **Weapon Possession at School or on School Grounds**

Knife	Lead pipe
Brass knuckles	Taser
Gun	Method of procurement
Club or bat	Place of procurement
Brick	Reason for obtaining or carrying
Board	Rounds held in handgun when fully loaded
Rock	Size of gun barrel
Scissors	Frequency of carrying
Explosives	Location of carrying
Mace	Location of storage
Pepper spray	Gang involvement in gun procurement
Whistle	Source of weapon
Razor blade	Cost of weapon
Numchucks	

### **III. Youth Violence Perpetration or Victimization**

The following are examples of youth perpetration and victimization. These examples are by no means a complete list of violent acts that a student can either commit or be the victim of, but these items are common for most instruments examining youth attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors associated with youth crime and violence. Because more extreme acts of violence, such as sexual assault and murder, occur very rarely at school, on-campus violence intervention initiatives will have the greatest impact on more common types of violence, such as fighting, kicking, pushing, and other behaviors, that account for the bulk of violent incidents at school. However, effective interventions should have an impact on all types of violence, not just common violence.

#### **Common Violence**

Hits, punches, or slaps with hand or fist  
Kicks with foot  
Pushes  
Hits with an object he or she was holding or threw  
Bullies or hurts smaller students  
Shoves or trips someone  
Sits on someone or pins someone down  
Steps on someone's foot or other part of their body  
Pulls, twists, squeezes, pokes, or pinches part of someone's body (hair, arm, leg, and so on) or pulls on their clothes  
Starts fights  
Wrestles  
Chases  
Engages in fights started by others  
Engages in a serious fight  
Engages in group or gang fights  
Gets people to gang up on someone to hurt him or her

#### **Inventive Violence**

Forces someone to hurt himself or herself  
Forces one person to hurt another person  
Forces someone's head under water so they can't breathe  
Burns someone with a flame, a hot liquid, a hot object, or acid  
Covers someone's nose or mouth so they can't breathe  
Ties someone up or locks them in a closet or room  
Bites someone with their teeth  
Makes loud noises and hurts someone's ears  
Drops something on someone else

Plays mean tricks  
Stalks or follows  
Has another person do any of the above (for pay, as a favor, as gang initiation)

### **Severe Menacing**

Lays a trap for someone to get hurt  
Threatens to hurt someone with a weapon  
Frightens someone with fists  
Frightens someone with stick  
Frightens someone with knife  
Frightens someone with gun  
Makes sexual gestures to someone who does not like them  
Telephones someone to annoy, threaten, or frighten  
Telephones in bomb threat to school or other institution

### **Menacing Verbal or Body Language**

Threatens to harm someone  
Yells, screams, rants, raves, or shouts angrily at someone  
Uses body language to threaten someone or express disapproval (looks mean, clenches fist, sticks out tongue, and the like)  
Joins in a group to surround someone in a hostile manner  
Lets someone know he or she has friends, family or others who might hurt him or her  
Taunts, ridicules, teases, provokes, or yells insults  
Uses epithets or slurs  
Curses viciously in anger  
Makes moderate threats toward others  
Makes severe threats toward others

### **Impulsive Violence**

Usually hits another person when angry and feeling a sudden urge to hit  
Sometimes gets mad enough to lose control and attacks another person  
Feels he or she can't help responding violently if someone disrespects him or her  
Feels people should treat him or her with more respect if they want to avoid the violence  
Often does not stop to think about consequences before acting when feeling a violent impulse  
Slams doors  
Scatters clothing  
Makes a mess  
Throws objects  
Kicks furniture without breaking it  
Bangs/marks the wall

Breaks objects

Smashes windows

### **Less Extreme Sexual Assaults**

Inappropriate touching, fondling, caressing

Sexual harassment

Intentional bumping when in a group or passing by (involving sexual body parts)

Indecent exposure

Staring at body parts

Peeping into dressing areas

Sexual hazing

### **Extreme Violence**

Assault with a weapon

Aggravated assault

Armed robbery

Armed extortion

Murder

Gang-related killings

Sniper attack

Nonnegligent manslaughter

Rape

Severe beating

Threatening terrorism

Bombing

Arson

Drive-by shootings

Kidnapping

Hostage-taking

Car-jacking

Attempted rape

### **Violence Against Authority Figures**

Argues with older siblings

Argues with father or mother

Argues with teachers

Argues with school administrators

Argues with police officers

Taunts, teases, or provokes...

Hits...

Steals from ....

Assaults without a weapon...

Assaults with a weapon...

Verbally abuses...

## **IV. Witnessing Violence**

Unfortunately, violence is pervasive in our culture, and it can be found in homes, schools, streets, and communities. Often, children who frequently witness violence or who are victims of violence are more likely to exhibit problem behavior and perpetrate violent acts than those who are farther removed from violent behavior. Exposure to family violence has greater impact on a child than does exposure to other forms of violence that occur outside the home. However, students, who because of violence at school are afraid to attend, have a tendency to be more fearful of other students, dislike their teachers and their school, and have trouble maintaining academic standards. Additionally, youth who frequently witness violence tend to be hypersensitive to possible threats, have heightened levels of aggression and delinquency, and in some cases,

increased levels of depression and somatic complaints.

### **Witnessing Extreme Violence**

Assault with a weapon  
Aggravated assault  
Armed robbery  
Armed extortion  
Beating  
Murder  
Gang-related killing  
Sniper attack

Non-negligent manslaughter  
Attempted rape  
Rape  
Hostage-taking  
Kidnapping  
Drive-by shooting  
Bombing  
Terroristic threatening

## **V. Outcomes**

Once a student has been found to have committed an act of violence against another student or member of the school staff, there are multiple options for punishment. These options range from simple sanctions administered by parents or school administrators to more serious punishments handed down by the criminal justice system. For all students, discipline needs to be consistent and proportionate to the severity of the infraction, and there should be due process before the punishment is administered. Some students who commit repeated serious acts of violence perhaps need to be placed in alternative school settings to ensure the safety and security of other students and staff. Removing weapon-carrying and chronically violent students from the general student population should be used as a last resort, but it sends a message that school administrators have acted appropriately to preserve school safety.

### **Administrative Outcomes**

Complaint filed with police  
School expulsion  
School suspension  
School discipline  
School detention  
No action taken  
Victim restitution

### **Criminal Justice Outcomes**

Detained by police  
Taken to police station  
Arrested  
Incarcerated in adult facility  
Incarcerated in juvenile detention facility  
Released to custody of guardian

Released to child protective services agency

Placed in foster home

Placed in voluntary group home

Placed in boot camp program

Placed in in-home detention

Victim restitution

### **Broader repercussions**

School failure

Underemployment

Pursuit of crime

Substance abuse

Teenage pregnancy

## **Part B. Survey Instruments**

### **I. Teacher Ratings of the Violent Behavior of Students**

#### **Aggressive Behavior-Teacher Checklist**

- Authors: Dodge and Coie, 1987
- Citations: McIntosh and Vaughn, 1993; Brown, Atkins, Osborne, and Milnamow, 1996; Crick and Dodge, 1996
- Ages: Elementary school children in grades one to six
- Description: This teacher-rating instrument consists of 12 statements that measure a child's aggressive behavior (using physical force, threatening others, and so on). The instrument consists of two scales and each scale consists of three questions.
- Scales: Reactive Aggression  
Proactive Aggression
- Instructions: Teachers are asked to indicate whether the statement applies to their student.
- Options: 1 = Never True  
2 = Rarely True  
3 = Sometimes True  
4 = Usually True  
5 = Almost Always True
- Scoring: This instrument is scored by averaging the three Reactive Aggression and the three Proactive Aggression questions. Some of the items are reverse scored.
- Properties: Each scale has an internal consistency greater than .90 (Dodge and Coie, 1987; Crick and Dodge, 1996).
- Cost: There is no cost for this instrument.
- Qualification: Available for individuals with proper research needs.
- Contact: Arnaldo Zelli  
Box 86 Peabody  
Vanderbilt University  
Nashville, Tennessee 37203  
  
Tel: (615) 343-8858

Options:      0 = Doesn't Apply  
                  1 = Applies Somewhat  
                  2 = Certainly Applies

Scoring:      Not available

Properties:    Reliability was rated by getting four teachers to rate eighty 7-year-old children (40 girls and 40 boys) in one school twice, with a 2-month gap between tests. Retest reliability correlations between the total scores on the two tests were greater than .89 and the interrater reliability was better than .72 (Rutter, 1967).

Cost:          Not available

Qualification: Not available

Contact:      See citations listed above.

**National School Crime and Safety Survey: Staff Form**

Authors: Kingery, Minogue, Murphy, and Coggeshall, 1998a

Citations: None available at this time.

Ages: For teachers of students in middle and high schools

Description: The National School Crime and Safety Survey: Staff Form was designed by the Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence to evaluate the effectiveness of several violence prevention or intervention programs being conducted at middle and high schools across the country. This instrument measures staff perceptions of school climate, safety, violence, and satisfaction with the violence intervention program being conducted at their school. The National School Crime and Safety Survey: Staff Form consists of 13 items with multiple response options (Yes/No and several Likert-type scales). The questionnaire takes approximately 15 minutes to complete and is intended for use with all school personnel involved in a school's violence intervention program. The instrument also contains 28 additional blank questions if a researcher or school administrator would like to add any supplemental questions not covered by this instrument.

Scales: Scales will be made available in May 1999.

Instructions: You have been selected to participate in a survey about crime and violence at your school. Intervention staff from across the country will be completing this survey. Your answers will help evaluate safety at your school. Please be completely honest in your responses. To protect your privacy and the confidentiality of your answers, do not write your name on the survey booklet.

Read each question carefully before marking your answer. Mark only one answer for each question unless the instructions tell you to "mark all that apply." Be sure to answer every question. If you need help while completing this survey or have any questions please feel free to ask for assistance from one of the individuals administering the survey.

Options: Multiple response options (Yes/No and Likert-type scales)

Scoring: Scoring for this instrument will be made available in May 1999.

Properties: As of November 1998 the National School Crime and Safety Survey: Staff Form had not been tested for reliability and validity. These results will be made available as soon as its initial trials are administered in May of 1999.

Cost: \$1 per instrument  
\$ .50 per instrument scanned

Cost includes a statistical report of findings.

Qualification: This instrument is available to anyone for evaluating a violence intervention program at a school or for a one-time assessment of crime and safety at a school.

Contact: Paul Kingery  
Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence  
1925 North Lynn Street, #305  
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209  
Tel: (703) 527-4217 ext. 104  
Fax: (703) 527-8741  
E-mail: Kingery@gwu.edu

### **New York Teacher Rating Scale**

Authors: Miller et al., 1995

Citations: Not available

Ages: Children and adolescents in grades 1–12

Description: The New York Teacher Rating Scale is a 92-item instrument designed for teachers to measure defiant, aggressive, and antisocial behavior of students.

Scales:	<u>Factor Scales</u>	<u>Composite Scales</u>
	Defiance	Antisocial Behavior
	Physical Aggression	Disruptive Behavior
	Delinquent Aggression	
	Peer Relations	

Instructions: Not available

Options: 0 = Not at all  
1 = Just a little  
2 = Pretty much  
3 = Very much

Scoring: Not available

Properties:	<u>Internal Consistency</u> (Miller et al., 1995)	<u>Test-Retest (5-week)</u>
	Factors Scales	Factor Scales

Defiance: .96  
Physical Aggression: .88  
Delinquent Aggression: .73  
Peer Relations: .90

Defiance: .83  
Physical Aggression: .62  
Delinquent Aggression: .67  
Peer Relations: .87

**Composite Scales**

Antisocial Behavior: .80  
Disruptive Behavior: .95

**Composite Scales**

Antisocial Behavior: .70  
Disruptive Behavior: .83

**Cost:** There is no fee for the New York Teacher Rating Scale.

**Qualification:** Anyone can use this instrument.

**Contact:** Dr. Laurie Miller  
Department of Child Psychiatry  
Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons  
New York State Psychiatric Institute  
722 West 168th Street, Unit 60  
New York, New York 10032  
Tel: (212) 263-8673

### **School Behavior Checklist**

**Author:** Miller, 1972; Miller, 1977

**Citations:** Harper, 1983; Serrano, 1996

**Ages:** Teachers rate their students on either of the following forms:  
Form A1 is for children ages four through six  
Form A2 is for children ages 7 through 13

**Description:** The School Behavior Checklist is designed to provide teachers with an objective and standardized evaluation of their students' classroom behavior. Both Forms A1 and A2 measure a wide range of social and emotional school behaviors from social competence to moderate social deviance indicative of psychopathological disorders. Teachers need approximately 8 to 10 minutes to complete the instrument. A professional mental health worker then evaluates the ratings to determine a child's behavior in school.

**Scales:** Need Achievement  
Aggression  
Anxiety  
Cognitive Deficit  
Hostile Isolation

Extraversion  
Normal Irritability  
School Disturbance  
Total Disability

**Instructions:** Teachers are asked to read each statement and judge whether it describes the child being rated. If the statement describes the child's behavior, they mark a "T" on a separate answer sheet. If the statement does not describe the child's behavior, the teacher marks an "F" on the answer sheet. Teachers are asked to answer all questions.

**Options:** True or False

**Scoring:** After scores have been obtained from various scales, they are then matched with the corresponding profiles found in the School Behavior Checklist Manual.

**Properties:** Test-retest reliability for the School Behavior Checklist had coefficients between .70 and .90 except for the Hostile Isolation scale, which had a reliability coefficient of .40 (Miller, 1977).

**Cost:** Set: \$90.00  
Checklist (pads of 25): \$9.50  
Answer Sheet (pads of 50): \$9.75  
Manual: \$35.00

**Qualification:** Eligibility to purchase professional materials is subject to the approval of Western Psychological Services. For a qualification questionnaire contact their Customer Service Department at (310) 478-2061.

**Contact:** Western Psychological Services  
12031 Willshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1251  
Tel: (310) 478-2061  
Fax: (310) 478-7838

### **School Social Behavior Scale**

**Author:** Merrell, 1993a

**Citations:** Merrell, 1993b; Merrell, Ceden, and Johnson, 1993; Worthen, Borg and White, 1993

**Ages:** Elementary and secondary age students

- Description:** The School Social Behavior Scale (SSBS) was primarily designed as a behavior rating instrument for teachers or other school personnel of students in grades K–12. It can be used as a screening instrument to identify possible at-risk students, determine student eligibility for intervention programs, and examine social competence and antisocial behavior patterns of children and adolescents.
- Scales:** The SSBS consists of 65 items in two major scales (Scale A, Social Competence, 32 items; and Scale B, Antisocial Behavior, 33 items). Scale A, Social Competence, contains three subscales: Interpersonal Skills, Self-management Skills, and Academic Skills. Scale B, Antisocial Behavior, also contains three subscales: Hostile-irritable, Antisocial-aggressive, and Demanding-disruptive.
- Instructions:** After the teacher or other school staff member has completed the student and rater information sections, he or she then rates the student on each of the items on pages 2 and 3 of this ratings form. The rating points are Frequently, Sometimes, and Never. Raters are asked to complete all items.
- Options:** Never = if the student does not exhibit a specified behavior  
Sometimes = if the student exhibits a specified behavior somewhere in between “never” and “frequently”  
Frequently = if the student often exhibits a specified behavior
- Scoring:** The process for scoring the SSBS involves two steps:  
1. Calculating raw scores for the subscales and total scores.  
2. Converting these raw scores to standard scores, percentile rankings, and social functioning levels using the raw score conversion tables in the user’s test manual.
- Properties:** According to the School Social Behavior Scales Test Manual (Merrell, 1993a), internal consistency reliability for the Social Competence and Antisocial Behavior scales was .96 to .98. The reliabilities of the subscales on the Social Competence scale ranged from .94 to .96. Reliabilities for the Antisocial Behavior subscales ranged from .91 to .96. Test-retest reliability of the SSBS for the Social Competence scales ranged from .76 to .82 and the coefficients for the Antisocial Behavior scale ranged from .60 to .73 (Merrell, 1993b).
- Cost:** Complete Program: \$39  
Examiner Manual: \$25  
Test Forms (20): \$16
- Qualification:** Available to anyone who would like to use the instrument.
- Contact:** PRO-ED  
8700 Shoal Creek Boulevard

Austin, Texas 78757-6869  
Tel: (800) 897-3202  
Fax: (800) 451-8542

**Social Behavior Questionnaire (Physical Aggression Items)**

- Authors: Tremblay et al., 1991
- Citations: Haapasalo and Tremblay, 1994; Seguin, Pihl, Harden, Tremblay, and Boulerice, 1995
- Ages: Teachers rate children and adolescents ages 6–14
- Description: The Social Behavior Questionnaire includes three physical aggression items: fights with other children; kicks, bites, hits other children; and bullies or intimidates other children.
- Scales: Physical Aggression
- Instructions: Unavailable
- Options: 0 = Does not apply  
1 = Sometimes  
2 = Frequently
- Scoring: Unavailable
- Properties: Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) for the total score on the three fighting items was .87 for children 6 years old and .86, .86, and .78 for children ages 10, 11, and 12, respectively (Haapasalo and Tremblay, 1994).
- Cost: There is no cost for the Social Behavior Questionnaire.
- Qualification: The Social Behavior Questionnaire is available to anyone.
- Contact: Richard E. Tremblay  
Research Unit on Children's Psychosocial Maladjustment  
University of Montreal  
750, boul. Gouin est  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada H2C 1A6  
Tel: (514) 343-6963

## II. Parent Ratings of Aggressive and Violent Behavior of Their Children

### Behavior Assessment System for Children: Parent Rating Scales

Authors: Reynolds and Kamphaus, 1992

Citations: Sandoval, 1994; Fryxell, 1997

Ages: Children ages four and five receive the Parent Ratings Scale-P  
Children and young adolescents ages 6–11 get Parent Ratings Scale-C  
Adolescents ages 12–18 get the Parent Ratings Scale-A

Description: The Behavior Assessment System for Children (BASC) is designed to assess and identify children and adolescents with emotional disturbances and behavioral disorders. The BASC consists of five measures intended to gather information about children or adolescents from a variety of sources (teacher rating scale, parent rating scale, direct student observation system, student self-report of personality, and structured developmental history), which may be used individually or in any combination. This instrument takes approximately 10 to 20 minutes to complete.

Scales:	<u>Externalizing Problems</u> Aggression Hyperactivity Conduct Problems	<u>Internalizing Problems</u> Anxiety Depression Somatization	<u>School Problems</u> Attention Problems Learning Problems
	<u>Other Problems</u> Atypicality Withdrawal	<u>Adaptive Skills</u> Adaptability Leadership Social Skills Study Skills	

Instructions: Parents are asked to read each statement on the questionnaire and mark the response that best describes how their child has acted over the last 6 months.

Options: N = Never  
S = Sometimes  
O = Often  
A = Always

Scoring: The questionnaire has a built-in scoring system. The score is calculated by summing the number of circled items in each horizontal row. Once this step is complete, the total for each scale can be found by summing the numbers in each column of boxes.

Properties: Internal Consistency: .80 (rises with age to .90 with adolescents)  
 Test-retest reliability: middle .80's to the middle .90's over a 1-month period  
 (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 1992)

Cost: BASC Examination Starter Set: \$74.95  
 BASC Hand Scored Forms Starter Set: \$284.95  
 BASC PLUS Windows Starter Set: \$344.95  
 BASC Manual: \$64.95  
 Student Observation System: \$28.95

Qualification: Available for use by professional psychologists.

Contact: American Guidance Service  
 4201 Woodland Road  
 Circle Pines, Minnesota 55014-1796  
 Tel: (800) 328-2560

### **Child Behavior Checklist: Parent Form**

Author: Achenbach, 1991

Citations: Achenbach and Howell, 1993; Atkins and Stoff, 1993; McConaughy et al., 1994; Achenbach, Howell, McConaughy, and Stanger, 1995; Ferdinand and Verhulst, 1995; Weine, Phillips, and Achenbach, 1995; Best, 1996; Needleman, Riess, Tobin, Biesecker, and Greenhouse, 1996; Warren, Oppenheim, and Emde, 1996; Depaola, 1998

Ages: To be completed by parents of children and adolescents ages 4–18

Description: The Child Behavior Checklist is a device by which parents or other individuals who know the child well rate a child's problem behaviors and competencies. This instrument can either be self-administered or administered through an interview. The Child Behavior Checklist can also be used to measure change in a child's behavior over time or following a treatment. Separate editions of this instrument have been standardized for both males and females ages 4–5, 6–11, and 12–16. The first section of this questionnaire consists of 20 competence items (participation in sports, nonsports activities, organizations, jobs, friendships, and relationships with other individuals). The second section consists of 120 items on behavior or emotional problems during the past 6 months. Teacher Report Forms (TRF), Youth Self-Reports (YSR), and Direct Observation Forms (DOF) are also available for the Child Behavior Checklist.

Scales: Withdrawn                      Attention Problems

Somatic Complaints	Delinquent Behavior
Anxious/Depressed	Aggressive Behavior
Social Problems	Internalizing
Thought Problems	Externalizing

**Instructions:** Parents are asked to circle the number of times their child has exhibited the behavior listed during the past 6 months.

**Options:** 0 = Not True  
1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True  
2 = Very True or Often True

**Scoring:** Hand-scored profiles and templates or computer programs are available to score the Child Behavior Checklist.

**Properties:** Test-retest reliability: .93  
Interparent agreement: .76

**Cost:** Hand-scored forms (25): \$10  
Templates for Hand-Scoring: \$7  
Machine-Readable CBCL/4-18 Forms (25) completed by parents processed by Fax or a scanner: \$20  
Manual: \$25  
Computer Program for Scoring the CBCL/4-18: \$220

**Qualification:** Individuals need at least a Master's degree or appropriate certification in order to interpret the results of this questionnaire.

**Contact:** University Medical Education  
1 South Prospect Street  
Burlington, Vermont 05401-3456  
Tel: (802) 656-8313  
E-mail: Checklist@uvm.edu  
Web: <http://Checklist.uvm.edu>

### **Conners' Parent Rating Scale**

**Author:** Conners, 1973; Conners, 1989

**Citations:** Glow, Glow, and Rump, 1982; Loney and Milich, 1982; Ullmann, Sleator, and Sprague, 1985

**Ages:** Children ages five through seven

- Description:** Conners' Parent Rating Scale is used to characterize patterns of child behavior. Only individuals who are very familiar with the child should complete this instrument. Users of this instrument should be familiar with the limitations of such diagnostic instruments and with the standards for educational and psychological testing developed by the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education. Rating scales are also available for teachers (CTRS).
- Scales:**
- |                       |                      |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Conduct Disorder      | Psychosomatic        |
| Anxious-Shy           | Obsessive-Compulsive |
| Restless-Disorganized | Antisocial           |
| Learning Problem      | Hyperactive-Immature |
- Instructions:** Parents are asked to read each item on the scale and judge how much they think their child has been bothered by the items listed during the past month.
- Options:**
- 1 = not at all
  - 2 = just a little
  - 3 = pretty much
  - 4 = very much
- Scoring:** In each box (at the end of each line), scorers write the number that corresponds to the response. The scale is scored by adding the numbers in the boxes in each column. For columns A through I, they total the numbers in the boxes in each column. Subtotals for the left and right sides of the scoring form can be entered in the "Sum 1" and "Sum 2" boxes, respectively, at the bottom of the form. To obtain overall scale scores, scorers add the subtotals from "Sum 1" and "Sum 2" and enter the totals in the boxes labeled "Total" (Conners, 1989).
- Properties:** Test-retest reliability over 1 year for the Conners' Parent Rating Scales-93 range from .40 for the Psychometric factor to .70 for the Immature-Inattentive and Hyperactive-Impulsive factors (Glow, Glow, & Rump, 1982).
- Cost:**
- Conners' Parent and Teacher Rating Scale Manual: \$27
  - CPRS-48 Quikscore Forms (package of 25): \$22
  - CRPS-48 Quikscore Forms (package of 100): \$80
  - CPRS-93 Quikscore Forms (package of 25): \$22
  - CRPS-93 Quikscore Forms (package of 100): \$80
- Qualification:** One must have at least a graduate degree and knowledge of testing and measurement in order to obtain this instrument.
- Contact:** Multi-Health Systems, Inc.  
908 Niagra Falls Boulevard  
North Tonawanda, New York 14120-2060

Tel: (800) 496-8324  
Fax: (800) 540-4484  
Web: www.mhs.com

### **Personality Inventory for Children**

- Authors:** Lachar, 1982; Wirt, Lachar, Klinedinst, and Seat, 1977
- Citations:** Lachar and Gdowski, 1979; Lachar, Gdowski, and Snyder, 1982; Lachar, Gdowski, and Snyder, 1984; Wirt, Lachar, Klinedinst, and Seat, 1984; Keenan and Lachar, 1988; Kline, Lachar, and Gdowski 1992; Kline, 1994; Wrobel and Lachar, 1998
- Ages:** This inventory is completed by one of the child's parents. It is for use with children and adolescents ages 3 through 16.
- Description:** The Personality Inventory for Children (PIC) is an objective multidimensional test of child and adolescent behavior and emotional and cognitive status. The administrative booklet consists of 600 items to be completed by the child's parent or another rater who knows the child well.
- Scales:** The full-length version consists of 20 scales, including 16 standard profile scales and four broad-band factor scales. The 16 profile scales include three scales that measure informant response (Lie, Frequency, and Defensiveness), a general screening scale (Adjustment), and 12 substantive scales (Achievement, Intellectual Screening, Development, Somatic Concern, Depression, Family Relations, Delinquency, Withdrawal, Anxiety, Psychosis, Hyperactivity, and Social Skills) (Lachar, Gdowski, & Snyder, 1984).
- Instructions:** The parent is asked to indicate whether each statement describes his or her child.
- Options:** True or False
- Scoring:** The PIC can be scored and interpreted by computer via Western Psychological Service Test Report prepaid, mail-in answer sheets, microcomputer disk, or fax service.
- Properties:** In 1982, Lachar et al. (1982) described the validation of four Personality Inventory for Children factor scales: (I) Undisciplined/Poor Self-Control, (II) Social Incompetence, (III) Internalization/ Somatic Symptoms, and (IV) Cognitive Development. Coefficients for internal consistency for these four scales ranged from .81 to .92. The average test-retest reliability ranged from .82 to .92 (Lachar et al. (1982). Wirt et al. (1984) showed 2-week test-retest coefficients averaging .86.

- Cost:** Kit: \$225.00  
Administrative Booklet, Reusable (single booklet): \$22.50  
Administrative Booklet, Reusable (package of 5): \$76.50  
Administrative Booklet, Disposable (package of 25): \$57.50  
Profile Form, Ages 3–5 Years (pad of 100): \$19.50  
Answer Sheet, Hand-scored Using Scoring Keys (pad of 100): \$19.50
- Qualification:** Eligibility to purchase professional materials is subject to the approval of Western Psychological Services. For a qualification questionnaire contact the Customer Service Department at (310) 478-2061.
- Contact:** Western Psychological Services  
12031 Willshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1251  
Tel: (310) 478-2061  
Fax: (310) 478-7838

### **Preschool and Kindergarten Behavior Scales**

- Author:** Merrell, 1994
- Citations:** Jentzsch, 1996; Merrell, 1996a; Merrell, 1996b
- Ages:** Children 3 to 6 years of age.
- Description:** The Preschool and Kindergarten Behavior Scales (PKBS) is a 76-item ratings scale designed to measure both problem behaviors and social skills of children ages 3–6. The PKBS contains two major scales: Social Skills and Problem Behavior. The Social Skills scale measures positive social skill characteristics of well-adjusted children. The Problem Behavior scale measures problem behaviors with young children who are experiencing adjustment problems. This instrument can be used as a screening tool for identifying at-risk children and can be used to develop appropriate interventions. The PKBS is designed for use by parents or teachers but can also be completed by other individuals who know the child well enough to make an informed rating. It takes raters roughly 8 to 12 minutes to complete the PKBS.
- Scales:** Subscales of the PKBS are Social Cooperation, Social Interaction, Social Independence, Self-Centered/Explosive, Attention Problems/Overactive, Antisocial/Aggressive, Social Withdrawal, and Anxiety/Somatic Problems.
- Instructions:** The rater is asked to rate the child on each of the items of the PKBS. Ratings are based on the respondent's observations of the child's behavior over the last 3

months.

- Options:** Never = If the child does not exhibit specified behavior, or if the respondent has not had an opportunity to observe it  
Rarely = If the child exhibits a specified behavior or characteristic but only very infrequently  
Sometimes = If a child occasionally exhibits a specified behavior or characteristic  
Often = If the child frequently exhibits a specified behavior or characteristic
- Scoring:** Scoring the PKBS has two steps:  
1. Calculate raw scores for the subscale and total scores.  
2. Convert raw scores to standard scores, percentile rankings, and functional levels using the raw score conversion tables provided in the test manual.
- Properties:** Research findings presented in the PKBS test manual and later studies have provided evidence for moderate to excellent psychometric properties. Internal consistency estimates ranged from .81 to .97 on the subtest scores and between .94 and .97 for the Social Skills and Problem Behavior scales; test-retest reliability estimates at 3-month intervals were found to be .36 and .78 (Merrell, 1994); and, interrater reliability between preschool teachers and teacher aides for the total scores were found to be .36 and .63 (Jentzsch, 1996).
- Cost:** Complete set: \$69  
50 test forms: \$34  
Manual: \$37
- Qualification:** The Preschool and Kindergarten Behavior Scale is available for anyone to use.
- Contact:** PRO-ED  
8700 Shoal Creek Boulevard  
Austin, Texas 78757-6869  
Tel: (800) 897-3202  
Fax: (800) 451-8542  
Web: <http://www.proedinc.com>

### **Revised Louisville Behavior Checklist**

- Author:** Miller, 1967; Miller, 1984 (Revised)
- Citations:** Miller, Barrett, Hampe, and Noble, 1971; Miller, Hampe, Barrett, and Noble, 1972; Miller, 1980; Miller and Roid, 1988
- Ages:** Parents rate their children on one of the following three forms:  
Form E1 is appropriate for children 4 to 6 years old.

Form E2 is appropriate for children 7 to 12 years old.  
Form E3 is appropriate for adolescents 13 to 17 years old.

- Description:** The Louisville Behavior Checklist asks parents to recall past social and emotional behaviors of their children. This instrument is especially sensitive in discriminating psychotics from the general population and from other pathogenic groups. This instrument should only be interpreted by mental health professionals who are familiar with child psychopathology. Parents need approximately 20 minutes to complete the inventory.
- Scales:** Scales for Form E1 (ages 4–6) include Infantile Aggression, Hyperactivity, Antisocial Behavior, Aggression, Social Withdrawal, Sensitivity, Fear, Inhibition, Intellectual Deficit, Immaturity, Cognitive Disability, Severity Level, Normal Irritability, Prosocial Deficit, Rare Deviance, Neurotic Behavior, Psychotic Behavior, Somatic Behavior, Sexual Behavior, and School Disturbance Predictor. The Aggression Scale (47 items) is a broad-band factor scale composed of items from the Infantile Aggression, Hyperactivity, and Antisocial Scales. The other forms have roughly the same scales.
- Instructions:** After parents have supplied the requested information on the answer sheet, they read each statement in the questionnaire and decide whether it is true or false as applied to their child. If the answer is “true” or “mostly true” for the child then the child’s parent fills in the circle marked “T.” If the item is “false” or “mostly false” then the parent fills in the circle marked “F.”
- Options:** True or False
- Scoring:** This instrument can be either electronically scanned or hand scored. To obtain scores by hand place the correct template for a scale over the answer sheet and count the number of marks.
- Properties:** Spearman-Brown split-half reliability for Form E1 scales are Infantile Aggression, .88; Hyperactivity, .87; Antisocial Behavior, .82; Aggression, .92; Social Withdrawal, .80; Sensitivity, .70; Fear, .82; Inhibition, .91; Intellectual Deficit, .77; Immaturity, .77; Cognitive Disability, .80; Normal Irritability, .85; Prosocial Deficit, .79; Rare Deviance, .97; Neurotic Behavior, .89; Psychotic Behavior, .93; Somatic Behavior, .85; Sexual Behavior, .60 (Miller, 1984).
- Cost:** Set: \$195.00  
Questionnaire (package of 10): \$12.50  
Manual: \$45.00  
Answer-Profile Sheet (pad of 100): \$19.50  
Scoring Keys: \$29.50
- Qualification:** Eligibility to purchase professional materials is subject to the approval of Western

Psychological Services. For a qualification questionnaire contact Western Psychological Service's Customer Service Department at (310) 478-2061.

Contact: Western Psychological Services  
12031 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1251  
Tel: (310) 478-2061  
Fax: (310) 478-7838

### **The Self-Control Rating Scale**

Authors: Kendall and Wilcox, 1979

Citations: Robin, Fischel and Brown, 1984; Kaplan, 1985; Day and Peters, 1989; Lennings, 1991; Rohrbeck et al., 1991; Delva-Tauiiili, 1995

Ages: Preschoolers and elementary and secondary school students

Description: The Self-Control Rating Scale (SCRS) is a generalized measure of child self-control. Parents or teachers rate children on 33 behaviorally anchored items such as impatience, breaking things, rules-breaking, and distraction. The Self-Control Rating Scale was developed according to a cognitive-behavioral definition of self-control, which includes factors such as deliberation and problem solving, as well as having the ability to execute appropriate behavior.

Scales: Self-Control  
Impulsivity

Instructions: Parents or teachers rate a child according to the items listed on the scale by circling the number appropriate for the child being rated. Ratings should be compared to the child's behavior during the last 30 days.

Options: Students are rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from Always (1) to Never (7).

Scoring: The Self-Control Rating Scale is scored by summing ratings of the 33 items. The SCRS yields scores ranging from 33 to 231. Higher scores indicate poorer self-control.

Properties: Internal Consistency: .98 (Cronbach's alpha)  
Test-Retest Reliability: .84 (3–4 weeks for a sample of 24 students)

Cost: Consult the ordering information below about cost and availability of this instrument.

Qualification: Consult the contact below for qualification information.

Contact: Dr. Philip C. Kendall  
Temple University  
Department of Psychology  
Weiss Hall  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

### **III. Measures for School Counselors and Psychologists**

#### **Fears and Worries Student Questionnaire**

- Authors: Carr and Schmidt, 1994
- Citations: Not available
- Ages: Students in the eighth grade
- Description: This survey is used to measure students' fears and worries, such as sexual abuse, dying, relationships, getting good grades, and the like. This is a 40-item questionnaire that is administered by school counselors. The instrument takes about 10 minutes to complete.
- Scales: There are no scales in this instrument.
- Instructions: Students are asked to indicate their age, sex, and grade. They then fill in the circle on the survey that best corresponds to their answer for each item.
- Options: Students are rated on 40 items on a 5-point Likert-type scale:  
1 = Never worry about this  
2 = Rarely worry about this  
3 = Sometimes worry about this  
4 = Quite often worry about this  
5 = Worry about this almost all the time
- Scoring: The 40 items are averaged together to get a score.
- Properties: No reliability and validity information is available.
- Cost: There is no fee for this instrument. The Fears and Worries Student Questionnaire can be pulled from the article cited above.
- Qualification: This instrument is available for anyone to use.
- Contact: Tom Carr  
P.O. Box 344  
Hillsborough, North Carolina 27278  
Tel: (919) 732-9326 ext. 278

#### **The Hopelessness Scale for Children**

Authors: Kazdin, French, Unis, Esveldt-Dawson, and Sherick, 1983; adapted from the Hopeless Scale for Adults: Beck, Weissmann, Lester, and Trexler, 1974

Citations: Kazdin, Rodgers, and Colbus, 1986; DuRant et al., 1994; Thurber et al., 1996; Wehmeyer and Palmer, 1998

Ages: Psychiatric inpatient children aged 5 to 13

Description: The Hopelessness Scale for Children measures children's negative future expectations. The instrument consists of 17 questions and is written at a first to second grade reading level.

Scales: Hopelessness

Instructions: Respondents are asked to mark "True" or "False" for the items on the scale.

Options: True, False

Scoring: Responses are summed to calculate an overall score. A high score of 17 (maximum) indicates high levels of hopelessness or negative expectations about the future. A minimum score of 0 indicates a low level of hopelessness. Items 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, and 16 are reverse coded.

Properties: Internal consistency: .97  
Spearman-Brown split-half reliability: .96

Cost: Consult the contact below for current pricing information.

Qualification: Consult the contact information below for qualification information.

Contact: Dr. Alan E. Kazdin  
Department of Psychology  
Yale University  
Box 208205  
New Haven, Connecticut 06520-8205  
(203) 432-4545  
E-mail: alan.kazdin@yale.edu

### **Preschool Behavior Questionnaire**

Authors: Behar and Stringfield, 1974

Citations: Rutter, 1967; Behar, 1977; Tremblay, Desmarais-Gervais, Gagnon, and

“Certainly Applies” to describe the extent to which the child exhibits the behavior indicated in the statement.

Options: 0 = Does not apply  
1 = Applies sometimes  
2 = Frequently applies

Scoring: The score is calculated by summing the ratings. If a child’s score is 17 or higher (upper 10 percent), it could indicate that the child’s behavior is out of the ordinary and that further examination of the child is perhaps warranted.

Properties:	<u>Interrater Reliability</u>	<u>Test-Retest Reliability</u> (Behar, 1977)
	Overall Scale: .84	Overall Scale: .87
	Hostile-Aggressive: .81	Hostile-Aggressive: .93
	Anxious-Fearful: .71	Anxious-Fearful: .60
	Hyperactive-Distractable: .67	Hyperactive-Distractable: .94

Cost: Manual: \$5  
Answer Sheets (50) and Score Sheets (50): \$12

Qualification: The Preschool Behavior Questionnaire is only available to mental health professionals.

Contact: Lenore B. Behar  
1821 Woodburn Road  
Durham, North Carolina 27705

Tel: (919) 489-1888  
Fax: (919) 489-1832

## **The Wisconsin Aggressive Behavior in Schools Survey**

Author: Larson, 1993

Citations: Larson, 1997

Ages: School psychologists answer questions regarding the behavior referrals of aggressive students at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

Description: The Aggressive Behavior in Schools Survey is a 19-item questionnaire for use by school psychologists to assess the incidence of violence and the effectiveness of intervention strategies at schools. School psychologists rate the change in number of referrals for student aggression such as physical assaults, carrying a weapon to school, and other behaviors. This survey was designed as a research survey, rather than as an assessment instrument.

Scales: There are no scales in this instrument.

Instructions: There are no instructions for the survey. Readers simply answer the questions that are asked.

Options: 1 = Increased profoundly 75–100%  
2 = Increased significantly 50–75%  
3 = Increased moderately 25–50%  
4 = Little discernible fluctuation in the past 10 years  
5 = Decreased moderately 25–50%  
6 = Decreased significantly 50–75%  
7 = Decreased profoundly at least 75–100%.

Scoring: Sum of school psychologists answering items (reported in percentages).

Properties: No reliability and validity information available.

Cost: The Wisconsin Aggressive Behavior in Schools Survey is free to anyone and can be pulled from the article cited above.

Qualification: This instrument is available for anyone to use.

Ordering: James Larson, Ph.D.  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
800 West Main Street  
Whitewater, Wisconsin 53190  
Tel: (414) 472-5412

Fax: (414) 472-5716

## IV. Student Self-Reports of Violence, Aggression, and Anger

### Adolescent Violence Survey

Author: Kingery, 1998

Citations: Kingery, Minogue, Murphy, and Coggeshall, 1998b

Ages: Middle school- to high school-aged students

Description: The Adolescent Violence Survey is a self-report questionnaire completed by adolescents in their school classroom. The Adolescent Violence Survey is recommended for the measurement of relatively common low- to moderate-level violent behaviors for the general population of students in middle school through grade 12. This is a 41-item instrument containing six violence subscales, which are described below. All subscales have high internal consistency, high test-retest reliability, construct validity, and approximately normal distributions.

Scales: Violence  
Common Violence                      Impulsive Violence  
Inventive Violence                      Menacing Language  
Passive Aggression                      Severe Menacing

Victimization  
Similar to the violence scales listed above.

Instructions: Students are asked to mark how many times in their lifetime have they done any of items listed in the survey to injure another person. These behaviors could have occurred at school, at home, or somewhere else.

Options: 0 = never  
1 = once  
2 = twice  
3 = 3–5 times  
4 = 6–9 times  
5 = 10–19 times  
6 = 20–29 times  
7 = 30–39 times  
8 = 40 or more times

Scoring: The Violence composite of the Adolescent Violence Survey is calculated in two ways: (1) by summing the ratings for all 41 items on the questionnaire, and (2) by summing the z-scores for the six violence subscales.

Properties: The broader violence scale has an internal consistency of .95 (Cronbach's alpha)

and a test-retest reliability of .91 (Pearson r) over a 1-week period (Kingery, 1998).

Violence Subscale	Internal Consistency	Test-Retest Reliability
Common Violence	.91	.88
Inventive Violence	.84	.77
Passive Aggression	.92	.84
Severe menacing	.75	.76
Menacing Language	.78	.83
Impulsive Violence	.78	.86

Reliabilities are in the .59 to .69 range for students in Alternative Education Settings reporting over the past 30 days, using a unique scale designed for such students.

Cost: \$1.50 per student per test (includes the survey booklet, scanning, scoring, and a report for the group of surveys submitted in a single bundle).

Qualification: No special qualifications are required.

Contact: Dr. Paul Kingery  
The Violence Prevention Network  
6430 27th Street North  
Arlington, VA 22207  
Tel: (703) 532-0987  
E-mail: Kingery@Violence.Prevention.Net (Under construction)  
Web: WWW.Violence.Prevention.Net (Under construction)

### **The Aggression Inventory**

Author: Gladue, 1991a; Gladue, 1991b

Citations: Not available

Ages: From children in early puberty to college students

Description: The Aggression Inventory is modified from the Olweus Multifaceted Aggression Inventory. The Gladue modifications added behaviors that were reported by adult subjects (both male and female) during in-depth interviews about their past and current aggressive behaviors and by rewording items from the original Olweus inventory to be appropriate for use by adults. There are separate scales for both

males and females.

Scales: Physical Aggression  
Verbal Aggression  
Impulsive/Impatient Aggression  
Avoidance of Aggression

Instructions: Unavailable

Options: 1 = Does NOT apply AT ALL to me  
2 = Applies SOMEWHAT to me  
3 = Applies FAIRLY WELL to me  
4 = Applies WELL to me  
5 = Applies EXACTLY to me

Scoring: Unavailable

Properties: Internal Consistency for Men  
Physical (Cronbach's alpha: .82)  
Verbal (Cronbach's alpha: .81)  
Impulsive/Impatient (Cronbach's alpha: .80)  
Avoidance of Aggression (Cronbach's alpha: .65)

Internal Consistency for Women  
Verbal (Cronbach's alpha: .76)  
Impulsive/Impatient (Cronbach's alpha: .76)  
Physical (Cronbach's alpha: .70)  
Avoidance of Aggression (Cronbach's alpha: .70)

Cost: Contact Dr. Gladue for a free copy.

Qualification: Available to anyone for legitimate, not-for-profit use. If this instrument is used for other purposes a fee would apply.

Contact: Dr. Brian A. Gladue  
IHPHSR  
University of Cincinnati Medical Center  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45267-0840  
Tel: (513) 558-2753  
E-mail: Brian.gladue@uc.edu

### **The Aggression Questionnaire**

Authors: Buss and Perry, 1992

Citations: Not available

Ages: College students

Description: Revised version of the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory

Scales: Physical Aggression  
Verbal Aggression  
Anger  
Hostility

Instructions: Not available

Options: Each item was rated on a scale of 1 (extremely uncharacteristic of me) to 5 (extremely characteristic of me)

Scoring: Not available

Properties: Test-retest reliability: .80 (over 9 weeks)  
Internal Consistency:  
Physical Aggression: .85  
Verbal Aggression: .72  
Anger: .83  
Hostility: .77

Cost: Questionnaire is free and is printed in the article cited above.

Qualification: The Aggression Questionnaire is available to anyone who would like to use it.

Ordering: Dr. Arnold H. Buss  
Department of Psychology  
330 Mezes Hall  
University of Texas  
Austin, Texas 78712  
Tel: (512) 471-1157

### **The Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory**

Authors: Buss and Durkee, 1957

Citations: Gunn and Gristwood, 1975; Morrison et al., 1975; Renson, G.J. et al., 1978; Biaggio, 1980; Edmunds and Kendrick, 1980; Biaggio, Supplee, and Cutis, 1981;

Holland, Levi, and Beckett, 1983; Boone and Flint, 1988; Treiber et al., 1989; Buss and Perry, 1992; Allen, Moller, Rhoades, and Cherek, 1997

- Ages:** Initially tested on college students but can be used to measure hostility in older adolescents
- Description:** The Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory (BDHI) is a self-rated multidimensional scale of hostility. The BDHI is one of the earliest reliable and valid scales to measure hostility and has been widely used in research studies.
- Scales:** Assault Subscale (physical violence against others)  
Indirect Hostility Subscale (undirected aggression)  
Irritability (readiness to explode with negative affect with provocation)  
Negativism (oppositional behavior)  
Resentment (jealously and hatred of others)  
Suspicion (projection of hostility toward others)  
Verbal Hostility (negative affect expressed in style and content of speech)
- Instructions:** The tester reads to the respondent some behaviors that people use to handle problems and express feelings. The respondent is asked how often he or she behaved this way during the last week using the categories listed below.
- Options:** 0 = Zero Times a Week  
1 = Once a Week  
2 = Twice a Week  
3 = 3 to 4 Times a Week  
4 = 5 or More Times a Week
- Scoring:** Unavailable
- Properties:** Holland et al., (1983) found that the scale did not adequately discriminate violent behavior. Biaggio (1980) found the reliability of the subscales to be uncertain.
- Cost:** Packet on microfiche: \$11  
Shipping and handling and applicable State taxes: \$3
- Qualification:** The Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory is available to anyone.
- Ordering:** Educational Testing Service Test Collection  
ETS Tracking Number: TC009426  
Rosendale and Carter Roads  
Princeton, New Jersey 08541  
Tel: (609) 734-5689

## Multidimensional Anger Inventory

- Author: Siegel, 1984
- Citations: Siegel, 1986; Riley and Treiber, 1989; Siegel, 1992
- Ages: Originally designed for adults but can be used with students in grades seven and up.
- Description: The Multidimensional Anger Inventory (MAI) was developed to measure the duration, frequency, and magnitude of anger; the situations that make a person angry; the way anger is expressed; and the hostility of a person's outlook in life.
- Scales: Ten subscales compose the MAI:
- |           |                                     |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| Frequency | Guilt                               |
| Duration  | Brood                               |
| Magnitude | Anger-Discuss                       |
| Anger-In  | Hostile Outlook                     |
| Anger-Out | Range of Anger-Eliciting Situations |
- Instructions: Respondents are asked to read each statement and circle the number that best describes them.
- Options:
- 1 = if the statement is completely unresponsive
  - 2 = if the statement is mostly unresponsive
  - 3 = if the statement is partly unresponsive and partly responsive
  - 4 = if the statement is mostly responsive
  - 5 = if the statement is completely responsive
- Scoring: Not available
- Properties: Test-retest reliability: .75 (Pearson r)  
Internal consistency: range .84 to .89 in two samples (college students and factory workers) (Siegel, 1986)
- Cost: Consult the above citations for items in this instrument.
- Qualification: Not available
- Contact: Judith M. Siegel  
Division of Behavior Sciences and Health Education  
UCLA School of Public Health  
Los Angeles, California 90024

## **The Multidimensional School Anger Inventory**

- Authors:** Smith, Furlong, Bates, and Laughlin, 1998; Furlong and Smith, 1998
- Citations:** Fryxell, 1997
- Ages:** Students in grades 6–12
- Description:** The Multidimensional School Anger Inventory is a research instrument designed to measure affective, cognitive, and behavioral components of anger among youth. This scale is based on the School Anger Inventory (SAI) (Smith, Adelman, Nelson, & Taylor, 1988, which was modified from the Children’s Inventory of Anger (Finch, Saylor, & Nelson, 1987).
- Scales:** Anger Experience  
Cynical Attitudes  
Destructive Expression
- Instructions:** Not available
- Options:** Four-point Likert-type response for the 27 anger expression items  
1 = I’m not angry at all  
2 = I’m a little bit angry  
3 = I’m pretty angry  
4 = I’m very angry. I’m furious
- The anger expression portion of the questionnaire asks about how frequently the youth express anger in various ways using these responses:  
1 = Never  
2 = Occasionally  
3 = Often  
4 = Always
- Scoring:** Not available
- Properties:** Evaluations of the Anger Experience subscale have shown it to have high alpha coefficients ranging from .84 to .88. The Cynical Attitudes subscale has been shown to have moderate internal consistency with alpha coefficients ranging from .75 to .82. The internal consistencies of the Positive Coping (ranging from .68 to .74) and the Destructive Expression (range = .58 to .79) subscales were at moderate levels (Smith et al., 1998).
- Cost:** There is no commercial cost for the instrument but the authors of the instrument would like those who want to use the MSAI to discuss the possibility of sharing data and reporting with them.

Qualification: Contact the individuals listed below for qualification information.

Contacts:	Mike Furlong	Doug Smith
	University of California	University of Hawaii, Manoa
	Graduate School of Education	1776 University Avenue
	Santa Barbara, California 93106	Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
	E-mail:	E-mail:
	mfurlong@education.ucsb.edu	smithdou@hawaii.edu

### **Personality Inventory for Youth**

Authors: Lachar and Gruber, 1995

Citations: Wrobel and Lachar, 1998

Ages: Children and adolescents in grades 4 through 12.

Description: The Personality Inventory for Youth (PIY) is based on the Personality Inventory for Children, a widely used parent-report scale described above. The PIY is a student self-report that assesses emotional and behavioral adjustment, family interaction, and school and academic functioning. This instrument is written at the third grade reading level, consists of 270 questions, and can be completed in roughly 45 minutes. The PYI has 9 nonoverlapping clinical scales and 24 nonoverlapping subscales, which are listed below.

Scales: Cognitive Impairment  
Poor Achievement and Memory  
Inadequate Abilities  
Learning Problems

Impulsivity/Distractability  
Brashness  
Distractability and Overactivity  
Impulsivity

Delinquency  
Antisocial Behavior  
Dyscontrol  
Noncompliance

Family Dysfunction  
Parent-Child Conflict

Parent Maladjustment  
Marital Discord

Reality Distortion  
Feelings of Alienation  
Hallucinations and Delusions

Somatic Concern  
Psychosomatic Syndrome  
Muscular Tension and Anxiety  
Preoccupation with Disease

Psychological Dysfunction  
Fear and Worry  
Depression  
Sleep Disturbance

Social Withdrawal  
Social Introversion  
Isolation

Social Skill Deficits  
Limited Peer Status  
Conflict with Peers

Instructions: Students are asked to read the items and answer whether these items are true or false according to them.

Options: True or False

Scoring: The PIY can be scored by hand or by computer with prepaid, mail-in answer sheets.

Properties: All PIY sales are considered elevated if  $T \geq 60$ .  
Test-retest reliability and alpha coefficients are mainly in the .80's (Wrobel and Lachar, 1998).

Cost: PIY Kit: \$225.00  
Manual (Administration and Interpretation Guide and Technical Guide): \$87.50  
Administration Booklet: \$25.00  
Answer Sheet (pad of 100): \$18.50

Scoring Templates: \$32.50  
Critical Items Summary Sheet: \$18.50

Qualification: Eligibility to purchase professional materials is subject to the approval of Western Psychological Services. For a qualification questionnaire contact their Customer Service Department at (310) 478-2061.

Contact: Western Psychological Services  
12031 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1251  
Tel: (310) 478-2061  
Fax: (310) 478-7838

### **Social Skills Rating System (Student Self Report)**

Authors: Gresham and Elliot, 1990

Citations: Zucca-Brown, 1997

Ages: Students in grades 3 through 12

Description: The Social Skills Rating Systems (SSRS) allows professionals to screen and classify children and adolescents suspected of having significant social behavior problems. The SSRS also aids in the development of appropriate interventions for identified children. There are separate behavior ratings forms for completion by the teacher, the parent, and the student. The SSRS is a 3-page questionnaire consisting of 39 to 49 items. It takes respondents approximately 10 to 25 minutes to complete the instrument.

Scales:	<u>Social Skills</u>	<u>Problem Behaviors</u>	<u>Academic Competence</u>
	Cooperation	Externalizing Problems	Rated without separate
	Assertion	Internalizing Problems	subscales
	Responsibility	Hyperactivity	
	Empathy		
	Self-Control		

Instructions: Students are asked to read to each sentence and describe how often they do the behavior described.

Options: 0 = Never  
1 = Sometimes  
2 = Very Often

Scoring: Scored by hand or computer.

Properties: Test-retest reliability: ranges from .65 to .93

Coefficient alpha reliability: ranges from .81 to .85  
Subscale reliabilities: range from .48 to .88

Cost: Contact publisher for current list price.

Qualification: Contact American Guidance Service, Inc., below, for qualification information.

Contact: American Guidance Service, Inc.  
Publisher's Building  
4201 Woodland Road  
P.O. Box 99  
Circle Pines, Minnesota 55014-1796  
Tel: (800) 328-2560

### **State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory**

Author: Spielberger, 1988c

Citations: Spielberger, 1988a; Spielberger, Krasner, and Soloman, 1988; Van Der Ploeg, 1988; Feindler, 1991; Fuqua et al., 1991; Kroner and Reddon, 1992; Eckhardt, Kassino, Tsytarev, and Sukhodolshy, 1995; Dalton, Blain, and Bezier, 1998

Ages: Children age 12 to adults up to age 67

Description: The State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI) is 44-item self-report that measures the experience and expression of anger. The STAXI takes approximately 15 minutes to administer and is written at a fifth grade reading level.

Scales:	<u>State Anger</u> (One Scale)	<u>Trait Anger</u> Angry Temperament Angry Reaction	<u>Anger Expression</u> Anger-Out Anger-In Anger Control
---------	-----------------------------------	---	---

Instructions: Varied

Options: Four-point scale that assesses the frequency and intensity of angry feelings at a given moment in time.

Four-Point Likert for State Anger

1 = Not at all...

Four Point-Likert for Trait Anger  
and Anger Expression Subscales

1 = Almost Never

4 = Very much so...

4 = Almost Always

- Scoring:** The STAXI is a hand-scored assessment. The STAXI booklet contains a self-carbon page, which provides scores for each item. Scores are then totaled and entered on a scoring grid in the booklet that contains raw scores, percentiles, *T*-scores, and a profile graphing percentile scores.
- Properties:** Coefficient alpha for State Anger and Trait Anger: ranges from .84 to .93  
Coefficient alpha for Trait-Temperament: ranges from .84 to .89  
Anger Expression Scales: ranges from .73 to .85  
(Spielberger, 1988b)
- Cost:** STAXI Examination Kit: \$82  
STAXI Test Manual: \$29  
STAXI Test Booklets: \$33  
STAXI Rating Sheets: \$33
- Qualification:** The STAXI can be administered and scored by individuals with little training, however, the instrument should only be interpreted by individuals trained in psychology, psychiatry, or educational testing. Contact the ordering address listed below for a qualification form.
- Ordering:** Sigma Assessment Systems, Inc.  
P.O. Box 610984  
Port Huron, Michigan 48061-0984  
E-mail: [sigma@sigmaassessmentsystems.com](mailto:sigma@sigmaassessmentsystems.com)  
Web: <http://www.mgl.ca/~sigma/staxi.htm>

### **Weinberger Adjustment Inventory**

- Author:** Weinberger and Schwartz, 1990
- Citations:** Farrell, Danish, and Howard, 1992; Feldman and Weinberger, 1994
- Ages:** Urban sixth grade students
- Description:** The Weinberger Adjustment Inventory measures self-restraint and overall adjustment in adolescents. It includes four subscales: Suppression of Aggression, Considerations of Others, Impulse Control, and Responsibility. The Weinberger Adjustment Inventory can be administered in classrooms to groups of students.
- Scales:** Restraint  
Distress  
Low Self-Esteem

Instructions: Unavailable

Options: Items 1 and 5 are scored according to the following scale. (Items 2, 3, 4, and 6 are reverse scored).

- 1 = False
- 2 = Somewhat False
- 3 = Not Sure
- 4 = Somewhat True
- 5 = True

Items 7, 11, 16, 19, 21, 26, 27, and 29 are scored according to the following scale:

- 1 = Never
- 2 = Not Often
- 3 = Sometimes
- 4 = Often
- 5 = Almost Always

Scoring: The maximum obtainable score of 150 indicates a high level of emotional restraint. A minimum score of 30 indicates a low level of emotional restraint.

Properties: Internal consistency:  
Full scale: .85 to .88  
Suppression of Aggression: .79 to .82  
Consideration of Others: .68 to .68  
Impulse Control: .66 to .69  
Responsibility: .76 to .77

Cost: The cost of this instrument is flexible.

Qualification: The availability of this document depends on its application.

Contact: Daniel A. Weinberger, Ph.D.  
Wellen Center  
P.O. Box 22807  
Beachwood, Ohio 44122  
Tel: (440) 808-1500  
Fax: (440) 808-1503  
E-mail: Daw7@po.cwru.edu

## **Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS)**

Author: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

- Citations: Kolbe, Kann, and Collins, 1993; DuRant, Pendergast, and Cadenhead, 1994; Nelson, Higginson, and Grant-Worley, 1994; Greene, 1995; Valois, McKeown, Garrison, and Vincent, 1995; DuRant, 1996; Gabriel, Hopson, Haskins, and Powell, 1996; DuRant, Kahn, Beckford, Hayden, and Woods, 1997; Hill, 1997; Kann et al., 1997
- Ages: The YRBS was designed at a seventh grade reading level but is intended for use by students in grades 9 through 12.
- Description: The Center for Disease Control and Prevention's Youth Risk Behavior Survey was developed to assess the prevalence of risk behaviors associated with the leading causes of illness and death among youth in the United States. The YRBS is an anonymous self-administered, 84-item questionnaire, which contains questions about weapon carrying, physical fighting, and victimization on school property. The questionnaire also asks questions about substance abuse, sexual behavior, and dietary behavior. Data for the YRBS are collected every 2 years, and the CDC provides technical assistance to States interested in administering the instrument.
- Instructions: Varied
- Options: Yes or No      0 days  
                                  1 or 2 days  
                                  3 to 5 days  
                                  6 to 9 days  
                                  10 to 19 days  
                                  20 to 29 days  
                                  All 30 days
- Scoring: Neither scales nor scoring is provided.
- Properties: The majority of item reliabilities on the YRBS are substantial (.61–.80) or higher; 71.7 percent of the items were rated as having substantial or higher reliability (kappa = .61–1.00).
- Cost: There is no charge for this instrument.
- Qualification: The YRSB is a public document and is available to anyone.
- Contact: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
 Division of Adolescent and School Health  
 4770 Buford Highway, NE  
 Atlanta, Georgia 30341-3724  
 Tel: (770) 488-3257  
 Web: [www.cdd.gov/nccdphp/dash](http://www.cdd.gov/nccdphp/dash)

## **V. Peer Nominations of Violence and Aggression**

### **The Peer Nomination Inventory**

Authors: Eron, Walder, and Lefkowitz, 1971

Citations: Huesmann, Eron, Lefkowitz, and Walder, 1984; Huesmann, Eron, and Guerra 1992; Kennedy and Perry, 1993; Huesmann, Eron, Guerra, and Crawshaw, 1994

Ages: Elementary school children in grades one through six

Description: The Peer Nomination Inventory measures childhood peer-nominations of aggression.

Scales:	Aggression	Rejection
	Prosocial Behavior	Victimization
	Popularity	Hyperactivity

Instructions: Unavailable

Options: Students are given a list of names of children in their class and are asked to mark the names of every student who fits the description of each question asked.

Scoring: The Aggression scale is scored by summing the number of times a child is nominated by peers on 10 aggression questions and then dividing by the total number of nominators.

The Prosocial scale consists of four items that indicate the proportion of times the child was nominated on these items by the nominator.

The Popularity scale consists of two items, with a higher score indicating greater popularity.

The Rejection scale is scored using two items, with a higher score indicating more frequent rejection by peers.

The Victimization scale consists of two items. with a higher score indicating greater levels of victimization.

The Hyperactivity scale is scored using two items, with higher scores indicating greater levels of hyperactivity.

Properties: Internal consistency: .98  
One-year stability: .62  
Coefficient alphas:

Aggression: .97  
Popularity: .91  
Rejection: NA  
Victimization: .85  
Hyperactivity .95  
Prosocial Behavior .94

Cost: The instrument is free and can be pulled from the citations listed above.

Qualification: The Peer Nomination Inventory is available for anyone to use.

Contact: L. Rowell Huesmann, Ph.D.  
Research Center for Group Dynamics  
Institute for Social Research  
University of Michigan  
426 Thompson Street  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106-1248  
Tel: (734) 764-8385  
Fax: (734) 936-0200

### **Pupil Evaluation Inventory**

Authors: Pekarik, Prinz, Liebert, Weintraub, and Neale, 1976

Citations: Weintraub, Prinz, and Neale, 1978; Ledingham, 1981; Ledingham, Younger, Schwartzman, and Bergeron, 1982; Younger, Schwartzman, and Ledingham, 1985; Johnston, Pelham, Crawford, and Atkins, 1988; Epkins, 1994; Epkins and Meyers, 1994; Frankel and Myatt, 1994

Ages: Children in grades one through nine

Description: The Pupil Evaluation Inventory (PEI) was developed to assess peer ratings of the behavior of male and female children in grades one through nine. Items are arranged against children's names in a matrix form that allows every child to be selected for each item. Each student rates each other student in the class by placing an "X" in the box corresponding to items descriptive of the child being rated. Five components of behavior are described by the items: aggressive disruptiveness; immature, nonaggressive disruptiveness; social isolation; oversensitive, unhappy; popularity and likeability. This instrument contains 34 items and one training item. (A shorter, 17-item instrument is also available for first graders.) It takes students approximately 30 minutes to complete this instrument.

Scales: This measure consists of three factors: Aggression, Withdrawal, and Likeability.

- Instructions: Students are asked to place an “X” in the box corresponding to items descriptive of the child being rated.
- Options: Names of peers in class.
- Scoring: The score is the percentage of students who nominated their classmate on that trait.
- Properties: Correlations for Aggression are mostly greater than .90, a significantly higher value than those on the Withdrawal or Likeability factors. There is also adequate test-retest reliability across both male and female groups. For items rated by males, the median test-retest correlation was .711 and for females .760 (Pekarik et al., 1976).
- Cost: Consult the above citations for items in this instrument.
- Qualification: The PEI should be administered and interpreted by trained clinicians.
- Contact: Consult the above citations for items in this instrument.

## VI. Weapons

### Attitudes Toward Guns and Violence Questionnaire

- Author: Clough, 1994
- Citations: Shapiro, Dorman, Burkey, Welker, and Clough, 1997; Shapiro, Dorman, Welker, and Clough, 1998
- Ages: Children and adolescents ages 8–18
- Description: The Attitudes Toward Guns and Violence Questionnaire measures attraction to guns and violence in relation to four major factors: Aggressive Responses to Shame, Excitement, Comfort with Aggression, and Power/Safety. This instrument requires reading skills at a grade level of 3.3. It takes most students approximately 15 minutes to complete the instrument.
- Scales: Aggressive Response to Shame  
Comfort with Aggression  
Excitement  
Power/Safety
- Instructions: Unavailable
- Options: 0 = Disagree  
1 = Not Sure  
2 = Agree
- Scoring: Antiviolence statements are reverse scored so that high scores indicate violence-proneness.
- Properties: The criterion for satisfactory internal reliability was a part-whole correlation equal to or greater than .20 ( $p < .0001$ ). Sixty of the 61 items met this criterion (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .94$ ). These results indicate a highly satisfactory level of internal consistency for the questionnaire. Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for the shortened measure was .88 compared to .94 in the 61-item questionnaire.
- Cost: This instrument is available in "Measuring Violence-Related Attitudes, Beliefs, and Behaviors Among Youth," published by the Centers for Disease Control Prevention at the contact number below.
- Qualification: Not available
- Contact: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Division of Violence Prevention  
National Center for Injury Prevention and Control  
4770 Buford Highway NE, MS K-60  
Atlanta, Georgia 30341-3742  
Web: <http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc>

### **Tulane University National Youth Study**

Authors: Sheley and Wright, 1995

Citations: Not available

Ages: Middle and high school students

Description: The Tulane University National Youth Study is a 56-item questionnaire that measures youth violence, weapons possession, gang involvement, and drug use. This instrument takes approximately 50 minutes to complete. Identification numbers are used rather than names, so respondents are assured confidentiality.

Scales: Not available

Instructions: The instructions tell the respondents to answer each question, assure the confidentiality of the answers, and give respondents instructions for mailing the instrument back to the researchers.

Options: Multiple response options

Properties: Not available

Cost: This study was funded by a Federal research grant and is free to anyone who would like to use it.

Qualification: This instrument is available for anyone to use.

Contact: Dr. Jim Wright  
Department of Sociology  
Tulane University  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118  
Tel: (504) 862-3012

## **VII. Measures of Community Violence**

### **The Children's Exposure to Community Violence Survey**

- Authors: Richters, 1990; Richters and Martinez, 1990
- Citations: Gladstein, Rusonis, and Heald, 1992; Fitzpatrick, and Boldizar, 1993; DuRant, 1994; Greene, 1995; Walsh, 1995; Berman, Kurtines, Silverman, and Serafini, 1996; DuRant, 1996; Gaba, 1996; Prilik, 1996; Ashen, 1997; Farrell and Bruce, 1997
- Ages: Adolescents ages 13–18
- Description: The Children's Exposure to Community Violence Survey is a self-report questionnaire for older youth. It measures the frequency of exposure to or being a victim of various types of violence in one's home, school, or neighborhood. This measure takes roughly 10 minutes to complete, and all responses should be kept anonymous and confidential. Counseling should also be made available to any respondents distressed by the questionnaire.
- Instructions: Unavailable
- Options: 1 = Never  
2 = Once or Twice  
3 = A Few Times  
4 = Many Times
- Scoring: Values are summed and divided by the total number of items (12) for each respondent. Higher scores indicate more frequent exposure to acts of crime and violence in the community.
- Properties: Internal Consistency: .84
- Cost: Not available
- Qualification: Not available
- Contact: Refer to the citations listed above for contact information.

### **The Children's Report of Exposure to Violence**

- Authors: Cooley, Turner, and Beidel, 1995
- Citations: Unavailable

Ages: Children and adolescents ages 9–18

Description: The Children’s Report of Exposure to Violence (CREV) assesses children’s exposure to violence through four modes: Media (television or film), Reported (people’s reports of occurrence), Witnessed (directly witnessed), and Victim (directly experienced). The CREV includes three categories of victims: Self, Strangers, and Familiar Persons. This report consists of 29 items and is self-administered.

Scales: Direct Exposure (to Violence)  
Media Exposure

Instructions: Questions ask children about violence against a strangers, familiar people, and self.

Options: 0 = No/never  
1 = One time  
2 = A few times  
3 = Many times  
4 = Every day

Scoring: Total scores CREV range from 0 to 116. Media content is scored 0 to 20, Reported and Witnessed violence each range from 0 to 40, and Victim content ranges from 0 to 16.

Properties: Test-retest reliability: .75 (over a 2-week period)  
Factor loading: .45 or higher for all items  
Cronbach’s alpha: Direct Exposure = .93  
Media Exposure = .75  
Total correlation = .78

Cost: There is no fee for this instrument.

Qualification: The Children’s Report of Exposure to Violence is available to anyone doing research.

Contact: Dr. Michelle Cooley-Quille  
Johns Hopkins University  
School of Public Health  
Department of Mental Hygiene  
Hampton House, 8th Floor  
624 N. Broadway  
Baltimore, Maryland 21205  
Tel: (410) 955-0413

E-mail: [mcquille@jhsph.edu](mailto:mcquille@jhsph.edu)

## VIII. School and Community Risk Factors

### MacArthur Neighborhood Study

- Authors: Elliott, 1996
- Citations: See above
- Ages: Youth 10 to 18 years of age
- Description: This instrument measures the organizational and cultural features of neighborhoods that affect adolescent development and behavior.
- Scales: Neighborhood  
Informal Control (mutual respect, institutional control, social control, and neighborhood bonding)  
Social Integration (neighborhood social organizations, informal activity, social support, number of children known by name)  
Informal Networks (friends and relatives)
- Youth  
Prosocial Competence (personal efficacy, educational expectations, grades, commitment to conventionality, involvement in conventional activity)  
Conventional Friends (prosocial friends, delinquent peers)  
Problem Behaviors (delinquency, drug use, arrests)
- Instructions: Not available
- Options: Multiple response options
- Scoring: Individual scale scores were standardized and then summed to create the higher-order constructs. Neighborhood-level scores were obtained by calculating the within-neighborhood mean of each construct across subjects.
- Properties: Internal Consistency (Cronbach's alpha)  
Neighborhood  
Informal Control  
Mutual Respect: .38 to .62  
Institutional Control: .66  
Social Control: .82 to .92  
Neighborhood Bonding: .69 to .73  
Social Integration  
Neighborhood Social Organizations: NA  
Informal Activity: .61 to .75

Social Support: .65 to .80  
Number of Children Known by Name: NA  
Informal Networks  
Friends in Neighborhood: NA  
Relatives in Neighborhood: NA

Youth

Prosocial Competence  
Personal Efficacy: .41 to .63  
Educational Expectations: NA  
Grades: NA  
Commitment to Conventionality: .22 to .63  
Involvement in Conventional Activity: NA  
Conventional Friends  
Prosocial Friends: .59 to .67  
Delinquent Peers: .72 to .79  
Problem Behaviors  
Delinquency: NA  
Drug Use: NA  
Arrests: NA

Cost: There is a fee for copying and mailing only.

Qualification: This survey is available on request from the contact listed below.

Contact: Dr. Delbert Elliott  
University of Colorado  
Institute of Behavioral Science  
Campus Box 442  
Boulder, Colorado 80309  
Tel: (303) 492-1266  
Fax: (303) 449-8479

**The Oregon School Safety Survey**

Authors: Sprague, Colvin, and Irvin, 1995

Citations: Not available

Ages: All members of the community can complete this survey.

Description: The Oregon School Safety Survey (OSSS) is an instrument that helps identify risk factors for school safety and violence and measures response plans that are being made in the school or neighborhood. The OSSS can be rated by administrators,

teachers, special education teachers, parents, related service providers, community members, students, or others.

Scales: Risk  
Protect

Instructions: The instructions ask the respondent to mark an “X” next to the item that best reflects their opinion.

Options: 1 = Not at all  
2 = Minimally  
3 = Moderately  
4 = Extensively

Scoring: Unavailable

Properties: Internal Consistency  
Risk: .87  
Protect: .82

Cost: The University of Oregon provides the instrument at \$1.00 each.

Qualification: Anyone can use the Oregon School Safety Survey.

Ordering: Jeff Sprague  
University of Oregon  
Institute on Violence & Destructive Behavior  
College of Education  
1265 University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon 97403-1265  
Tel: (541) 346-2465

Information about the Oregon School Safety Survey can be obtained from the World Wide Web at: <http://interact.uoregon.edu/sss/sss.html>

## **IX. Measurements of Gangs and Attitudes Toward Gangs**

### **Attitudes Toward Gangs**

Authors:	Nadel, Spellmann, Alvarez-Canino, Lausell-Bryant, and Landsberg, 1996
Citations:	Not available
Ages:	Students in grades 9–12
Description:	The Attitudes Toward Gangs scale is an eight-item measurement of juveniles' attitudes toward gangs.
Scales:	Attitude Toward Gangs Scale has two factors: positive and negative attitudes toward gangs.
Instructions:	Unavailable
Options:	0 = Not True For Me 1 = True For Me
Scoring:	The score is calculated by summing the scales' eight items and dividing the sum by the number of items. Items 5, 6, and 7 are reverse coded. Higher scores indicate a more positive attitude toward gangs.
Properties:	Positive Attitudes Toward Gangs: .74 (Cronbach's alpha) Negative Attitudes Toward Gangs: .64 (Cronbach's alpha)
Cost:	Contact the CDC for cost and availability information.
Qualification:	Not available
Contact:	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Division of Violence Prevention National Center for Injury Prevention Control 4770 Buford Highway NE, MS K-60 Atlanta, Georgia 30341-3742 Web: <a href="http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc">http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc</a>

### **National Youth Gang Survey**

Author:	Moore, John P.
---------	----------------

Citations: U. S. Department of Justice, 1997

Ages: Police and sheriff's departments report on youth gang activity (youth ages 10–22) in their jurisdictions.

Description: The National Youth Gang Center (NYGC) developed the National Youth Gang Survey to periodically obtain comprehensive national data on youth gang problems. The first National Youth Gang Survey was administered to 4,120 police and sheriff's departments across the country in 1995 to gather jurisdictional data on whether or not gangs were active in their communities, the number of gangs and their membership, youth gang members involved in homicides, an assessment of the current youth gang situation, and other similar information.

Scales: Not applicable

Instructions: Law enforcement officers are asked to report only on gang activity in their jurisdictions. Sheriff's departments are asked to report gang activity only for their unincorporated service area and any contacted communities. A definition of "youth gang" is also provided to the respondents: a group of youth in your jurisdiction, aged approximately 10 to 22, that you or other responsible persons in your agency or community are willing to identify or classify as a "gang." Respondents are also asked not to include motorcycle gangs, hate or ideological groups, prison gangs, or adult gangs.

Options: Multiple response options

Scoring: Not available

Properties: Not available

Cost: Free from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) at the contact listed below.

Qualification: Not applicable

Contact: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention  
 Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse/NCJRS  
 P.O. Box 6000  
 Rockville, Maryland 20849-6000  
 Tel: (800) 638-8736  
 Web: <http://www.iir.com/nygc/maininfo.htm>

## **X. Measures of Relationship Violence**

### **Acceptance of Couple Violence**

- Authors: Foshee, Fortergill, and Stuart, 1992; Foshee, et al., 1998
- Citations: Not available
- Ages: Students in grades eight and nine
- Description: This Acceptance of Couple Violence Scale measures acceptance of couple violence. This instrument consists of 11 items in three subscales listed below.
- Scales: Acceptance of Male on Female Violence  
Acceptance of Female on Male Violence  
Acceptance of General Dating Violence
- Instructions: Not available
- Options: 1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Agree  
4 = Strongly Agree
- Scoring: There are three subscales in this survey: the Acceptance of Male on Female Violence, the Acceptance of Female on Male Violence, and the Acceptance of General Dating Violence. Within each subscale, the score is summed and divided by the number of responses. A high score indicates a high level of acceptance of couple violence and a low score reveals a low level of acceptance.
- Properties: Internal Consistency  
Acceptance of Male on Female Violence: .74  
Acceptance of Female on Male Violence: .71  
Acceptance of General Dating Violence: .73
- Cost: There is no cost for the Acceptance of Couple Violence Questionnaire as long as the individual using it cites the author.
- Qualification: This instrument is available for anyone to use.
- Contact: Dr. Vangie Foshee  
School of Public Health  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Campus Box 7400  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599

Tel: (919) 966-6616  
Fax: (919) 966-2921

### **Perpetration in Dating Relationships**

- Authors: Foshee, Linder, and Bauman, 1996
- Citations: None
- Ages: Students in grades eight and nine
- Description: Measures self-reported victimization of physical violence within dating relationships.
- Scales: Not available
- Instructions: How many times have you ever done the following things to a person that you have been on a date with? Only include when you did it to him/her first. In other words, don't count it if you did it in self-defense. Please circle one number on each line.
- Options: 3 = 10 or More Times  
2 = 4 to 9 Times  
1 = 1 to 3 Times  
0 = Never
- Scoring: The score is calculated by summing the point values of the responses from a participant and dividing by the number of responses. A low score indicates a low level of perpetration and a high score indicates a high level of perpetration in dating relationships.
- Properties: Internal consistency: .93
- Cost: There is no cost for the Acceptance of Couple Violence Questionnaire as long as the individual using it cites the author.
- Qualification: This instrument is available for anyone to use.
- Contacts: Dr. Vangie Foshee  
School of Public Health  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Campus Box 7400  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599  
Tel: (919) 966-6616

Fax: (919) 966-2921

### **Victimization in Dating Relationships**

- Authors: Foshee, Linder, and Bauman, 1996
- Citations: Not available
- Ages: Students in grades eight and nine
- Description: Measures self-reported victimization or physical violence within dating relationships.
- Scales: Unavailable
- Instructions: Students are asked how many times a person they had been on a date with performed the actions described in the items.
- Options: 3 = 10 or More Times  
2 = 4 to 9 Times  
1 = 1 to 3 Times  
0 = Never
- Scoring: The score is calculated by summing the point values of the responses from a participant and dividing by the number of responses. A low score indicates a low level of victimization and a high score indicates a high level of victimization in dating relationships.
- Properties: Internal consistency: .90
- Cost: There is no cost for the Acceptance of Couple Violence Questionnaire as long as the individual using it cites the author.
- Qualification: This instrument is available for anyone to use.
- Contact: Dr. Vangie Foshee  
School of Public Health  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Campus Box 7400  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599  
Tel: (919) 966-6616  
Fax: (919) 966-2921

## **Appendix A: Additional instruments that may be**

## **useful to violence researchers**

**Adolescent Self-Report Trauma Questionnaire.** Horowitz, Weine, and Jekel, 1995.

**Adolescent Structured Interview.** Siegel and Leitch, 1981.

**Aggression Measure.** Slaby and Guerra, 1988.

**Aggression Questionnaire.** Erdley and Asher, 1993.

**Attitude Toward Conflict.** Lam, 1989.

**Attitude Toward Interpersonal Violence.** Slaby, 1989.

**Bank's Conflict Resolution Student Survey.** Banks, 1997.

**Barratt's Impulsivity Scale.** Barratt, 1959.

**Behavior Observation Schedule for Pupils.** Breyer and Calchera, 1971.

**Beliefs Supporting Aggression.** Bandura, 1973.

**Bullying-Behavior Scale.** Austin and Joseph, 1996.

**Child Conflict Index.** Frankel and Weiner, 1990.

**Child Self-Control Rating Scale.** Rohrbeck, Azar, and Wagner, 1991.

**Childhood Trauma Interview.** Fink, Bernstein, Handelsman, Foote, and Lovejoy, 1995.

**Childhood Aggression Peer Rating Scale (CAPERS).** McIntosh and Vaughn, 1993.

**Conflict in Relationships Questionnaire.** Wolfe, Reitzel-Jaffe, Gough, and Wekerle, 1994.

**Conflict Tactics Scales (Parent-Child Version).** Straus, Hamby, Finkelhor, Moore, and Runyan, 1998.

**Coping Resources Inventory for Stress.** Matheny, Curlette, Aycock, Pugh, and Taylor, 1987

**Edwards Personality Inventory.** Edwards, 1966.

**Fantasy Measure.** Rosenfeld, Huesmann, Eron, and Torney-Purta, 1982.

**Frequency of Delinquent Behavior.** Loeber and Dishion, 1983.

**Gang-Related Trauma Exposure Scale.** Burton, 1990.

**Gang Violence and PTSD.** Guevara, 1992.

**High Risk Situations Questionnaire for Young Offenders.** Howell, Reddon, and Enns, 1997.

**Individual Protective Factors Index.** Phillips and Springer, 1992.

**Interpersonal Violence Scale.** Rogers, 1988.

**Juvenile Justice Assessment Instrument.** Stein, Lewis, and Yeager, 1993.

**Keane PTSD Scale.** Keane, Malloy, and Fairbank, 1984.

**Kentucky Youth Survey.** Clayton, 1997.

**Knowledge and Attitudes about Relationship Violence.** Krajewski, Rybarik, Dosch, and Gilmore, 1996.

**Likelihood of Violence & Delinquency.** Flewelling, Paschall, and Ringwalt, 1993.

**Measure of Aggression, Violence and Rage in Children.** Bass, Geenens, and Popper, 1993.

**Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher: Violence in America's Public Schools.** Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, 1993.

**Missouri Children's Behavior Checklist, Form P.** Sines, 1985.

**Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire.** Tellegen, 1982.

**National Association of School Psychologists Survey on School Violence.** Furlong, Babinski, and Poland, 1994.

**National School Violence Survey: School Social Workers.** Astor, Behre, Wallace, & Fravil, 1998.

**Neighborhood/Block Conditions.** Perkins, Florin, and Rich, 1990.

**Neighborhood Disadvantage.** Elliott, 1996.

**New York Teacher Rating Scale.** Miller et al., 1995.

**Normative Beliefs About Aggression.** Huesmann, Guerra, Zelli, and Miller, 1992.

**Olweus' Aggression Inventory.** Olweus, 1977.

**Outcome Expectancies for Aggressive Behavior.** Kennedy and Perry, 1993.

**Overt Aggression Scale.** Yudofsky, Silver, Jackson, Endicott, and Williams, 1986.

**Peer Rating of Aggression.** Walder, Abelson, Eron, Banta, and Laulicht, 1961.

**Peer Rating Scale.** Rubenstein, 1975.

**Peer-Victimization Scale.** Neary and Joseph, 1994.

**Physical and Verbal Aggression in Peer Groups.** Rauste-von Wright, 1989.

**Principals' Perceptions of Violence in Schools.** Price and Everett, 1997.

**Problem-Oriented Screening Instrument for Teenagers.** Rahdert, 1991.

**Quality of School Life Scale.** Williams and Batten, 1981.

**Safe School Study: Teacher Questionnaire.** National Institute of Education, 1978.

**School Climate Check List.** California Office of the Attorney General, 1983.

**School Climate Survey for Teachers.** Freiberg, Stein, Waxman, and Wang, 1992.

**School Discipline Climate Survey.** Grossnickle, Bialk, and Panagiotaros, 1993.

**Schools and Staffing Survey.** National Center for Education Statistics, 1994.

**School Security Survey Form (CPTED).** Crowe, 1991.

**Self-Reported Delinquency Scale.** Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weiber, 1991.

**Social Problem Solving Competence Inventory.** Curtis 1996.

**Student Crisis Plan Sheet.** Myles and Simpson, 1994.

**Suicide and Aggression Survey.** Korn et al, 1992.

**Survey of School Violence Prevention Strategies.** Knapp, 1996.

**Survey of Violent Experiences.** Kidd-Burton, 1996.

**Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory.** Eyberg and Ross, 1978.

**Teacher Checklist of School Behavior.** Hutton and Roberts, 1983.

**Teacher-Child Rating Scale.** Hightower et al., 1986.

**Teacher Questionnaire (National Study of Prevention in Schools).** Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1996.

**Teacher Rating Scale for Reactive and Proactive Aggression (Revised).** Brown, Atkins, Osborne, and Milnamow, 1996.

**Teacher's Self-Control Rating Scale.** Humphrey, 1982.

**Three-State Survey.** Stickel, Satchwell, and Meyer, 1991.

**Urban High School Youth and Handguns Survey: A School Based Survey.** Callahan and Rivara, 1992.

**Violence Response Questionnaire.** Koel, 1992.

**Violence Survey.** Bell, Taylor-Crawford, Jenkins, and Chalmers, 1988.

**Walker-McConnell Scale of Social Competence and School Adjustment.** Walker and McConnell, 1988.

**Wilcox Self-Control Scale (Modified).** Lennings, 1991.

**Witness to Violence: The Child Interview.** Pynoos and Spencer, 1986.

## References

- Achenbach, T. M. (1991). *Integrative Guide to the 1991 CBCL/4-18, YSR, and TRF Profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Department of Psychology.
- Achenbach, T. M., & Howell, C. T. (1993). Are American children's problems getting worse? *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 32, 1145–1154.
- Achenbach, T.M., Howell, C. T., McConaughy, S. H., & Stanger, C. (1995). Six-year predictors of problems in a national sample of children and youth: I. Cross-informant syndromes. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 34(3), 336–347.
- Allen, T. J., Moller, F. G., Rhodes, H. M., & Cherek, D. R. (1997). Subjects with a history of drug dependence are more aggressive than subjects with no drug use history. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 46, 95–103.
- Ashen, C. A. (1997). *Feelings during the act of violent behavior among female adolescents and their relationship to exposure and experience of violence (Aggression, Juvenile Delinquency)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles.
- Astor, R. A., Behre, W. J., Wallace, J. M., & Fravil, K. A. (1998). School social works and school violence: Personal safety, training, and violence. *Social Work*, 43(3), 223–232.
- Atkins, M. S., & Stoff, D. M. (1993). Instrumental and hostile aggression in childhood disruptive behavior disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 21(2), 165–178.
- Austin, S., & Joseph, S. (1996). Assessment of bully/victim problems in 8 to 11 year-olds. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66, 447–456.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Banks, C. E., II. (1997). *Conflict resolution: Evaluating its effects on perceived school safety and measures of interpersonal conflict in middle school children*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University,
- Barratt, E. S. (1975). *Barratt's Impulsiveness Scale*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Bass, J. N., Geenens, D. L., & Popper, C. (1993). *Measure of Aggression, Violence, and Rage in Children (MAVRIC): A new quantitative measure of aggression in children and adolescents*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Beck, A. T., Weissman, A., Lester, D., & Trexler, L. (1974). The measure of pessimism: The Hopelessness Scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42(6), 861–865.

- Behar, L. B. (1977). The Preschool Behavior Questionnaire. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 5, 265–275.
- Behar, L., & Stringfield, S. (1974). *Manual for the Preschool Behavior Questionnaire*. Durham, NC: Author.
- Bell, C., Taylor-Crawford, Jenkins, E., & Chalmers, D. (1988). Need for victimization screening in a black psychiatric population. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 80, 41–48.
- Berman, S., Kurtines, W. M., Silverman, W., & Serafini, L. (1996). The impact of exposure to crime and violence on urban youth. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 66(3), 329–336.
- Best, S. R. (1996). *Secondary effects of maternal trauma on children of violent crime victims*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, Berkeley/Alameda.
- Biaggio, M. K. (1980). Assessment of anger arousal. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 44, 289–298.
- Biaggio, M. K., Supplee, K., & Curtis, N. (1981). Reliability and validity of four anger scales. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 45(6), 639–648.
- Boone, S. L., & Flint, C. (1988). A psychometric analysis of aggression and conflict-resolution behavior in Black adolescent males. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 16(2), 215–226.
- Breyer, N. L., & Calchera, D. J. (1971). A behavioral observation schedule for pupils and teachers. *Psychology in the Schools*, 8, 330–337.
- Brown, K., Atkins, M. S., Osborne, M. L., & Milnamow, M. (1996). A revised teacher rating scale for reactive and proactive aggression. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 24(4), 473–480.
- Burns, G. L. & Owen, S. M. (1990). Disruptive behaviors in the classroom: Initial standardization data on a new teacher rating scale. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 18(5), 515–525.
- Burton, D. L. (1990). *The relationship between trauma, family dysfunction, and the psychopathology in male juvenile offenders*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA.
- Buss, A. H., & Durkee, A. (1957). An inventory for assessing different kinds of hostility. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 21, 343–349.

- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(3), 452–459.
- California Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General. (1983). *Alternatives to school violence*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General.
- Callahan, C. M., & Rivara, F. P. (1992). Urban high school youth and handguns: A school-based survey. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 267(22), 3038–3042.
- Carr, T., & Schmidt, J. J. (1994). Who's Afraid of the...?: A survey of eighth graders' concerns. *The School Counselor*, 42, 6–72.
- Clayton, R. (1997). *Kentucky Youth Survey*. Lexington, KY: Center for Prevention Research, University of Kentucky.
- Clough, J. B. (1994). Attitudes Toward Guns and Violence. In L.L. Dahlberg, S.B. Toal, & C.B. Behrens (Eds.), *Measuring violence-related attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors among youths: A compendium of assessment tools* (pp. 40–43). Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Conners, C. K. (1973). Ratings scales for use in drug studies with children. *Psychopharmacology Bulletin*, 9, 24–29.
- Conners, C.K. (1989). *Manual for Conners' Rating Scales*. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems, Inc.
- Cooley, M. R., Turner, S. M., & Beidel, D. C. (1995). Assessing community violence: The children's report of exposure to violence. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 34(2), 201–208.
- Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1996). Social information-processing mechanisms in reactive and proactive aggression. *Child Development*, 67, 993–1002.
- Crowe, T. D. (1991). *Crime prevention through environmental design*. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Curtis, S. E. (1996). *Dispute management training and adolescents' social problem-solving competence, social self-efficacy and outcome expectations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing.
- Dalton, J. E., Blain, G. H., & Bezier, B. (1998). State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory scores of male sexual offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 42(2), 141–148.

- Day, A. M. L., & Peters, R. D. (1989). Assessment of attentional difficulties in underachieving children. *Journal of Education Research*, 82(6), 356–361.
- Delva-Tautilili, J. (1995). Does brief Aikido training reduce aggression of youth? *Perceptual Motor Skills*, 80(1), 297–298.
- Depaola, L. J. (1988). *The effects of witnessing conjugal violence on preschool children: A multimodal assessment*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California State University, Fullerton.
- Dodge, K. A., & Coie, J. D. (1987). Social-information-processing factors in reactive and proactive aggression in children's peer groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(6), 1146–1158.
- DuRant, R. H. (1996). Intentions to use violence among young adolescents. *Pediatrics*, 98(6), 1104–1108.
- DuRant, R. H., Kahn, J. Beckford, P. H., & Woods, E. R. (1997). The association of weapon carrying and fighting on school property and other health risk and problem behaviors among high school students. *Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine*, 151, 360–366.
- DuRant, R. H., Pendergrast, R. A., & Cadenhead, C. (1994). Exposure to violence and victimization and fighting behavior by urban black adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 15, 311–318.
- Eckhardt, C. I., Kassinove, H., Tsytsarev, S. V., & Sukhodolsky, D. G. (1995). A Russian version of the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory: Preliminary data. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 64(3), 440–455.
- Edmunds, G., & Kendrick, D. C. (1980). *The measurement of human aggression*. New York: Ellis Horwood Limited.
- Edwards, A. L. (1966). *Edwards Personality Inventory*. Chicago: Science Research Association.
- Elliot, D. S. (1996). The effects of neighborhood disadvantage on adolescent development. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 33(4), 389–426.
- Epkins, C. C. (1994). Peer ratings of depression, anxiety, and aggression in inpatient and elementary school children: Rating biases and influence of rater's self-reported depression, anxiety, and aggression. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 22(5), 611–628.
- Epkins, C. C., & Meyers, A. W. (1994). Assessment of childhood depression, anxiety, and aggression: Convergent and discriminant validity of self-, parent-, teacher-, and peer-report measures. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 62(2), 364–381.

- Erdley, C. A., & Asher, S. R. (1993, August). *Linkages between aggression and children's legitimacy of aggression beliefs*. Paper presented at the 101st Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, ON.
- Eron, L. D., Walder, L. O., & Lefkowitz, M. M. (1971). *Learning of aggression in children*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Eyberg, S., & Ross, A. W. (1978). Assessment of child behavior problems: The validation of a new inventory. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 16, 113–116.
- Farrell, A., & Bruce, S. E. (1997). Impact of exposure to community violence on violent behavior and emotional distress among urban adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 26(1), 2–14.
- Farrell, A. D., Danish, S. J., & Howard, C. W. (1992). Risk factors for drug use in urban adolescents: Identification and cross-validation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 20(3), 263–286.
- Feindler, E. L. (1991). Cognitive strategies in anger control interventions for children and adolescents. In P. C. Kendall (Ed.), *Child and adolescent therapy: Cognitive-behavioral procedures* (pp. 66-97). New York: Guilford.
- Feldman, S. S., & Weinberger, D. A. (1994). Self-restraint as a mediator of family influences on boys' delinquent behavior: a longitudinal study. *Child Development*, 65(1), 195–211.
- Ferdinand, R.F., & Verhulst, F. C. (1995). Psychopathology from adolescence into young adulthood: An 8-year follow-up study. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 152(11), 1586–1594.
- Finch, A. J., Jr., Saylor, C. F., & Nelson, III, W. M. (1987). Assessment of anger in children. In R. J. Prinz (Ed.), *Advances and behavior assessment of children and families* (pp. 235–265). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Fink, L. A., Bernstein, D., Handelsman, L., Foote, J., & Lovejoy, M. (1995). Initial reliability and validity of the Childhood Trauma Interview: A new multidimensional measure of childhood interpersonal trauma. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 152(9), 1329–1335.
- Fitzpatrick, K. M., & Boldizar, J. P. (1993). The prevalence and consequences of exposure to violence among African-American youth. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 32(2), 424–430.
- Flewelling, P. D., Paschall, M. J., & Ringwalt, C. L. (1993). *SAGE Baseline Survey*. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.
- Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., Arriaga, X., Helms, R. W., Koch, G. G., & Linder, G. F. (1998).

- An evaluation of Safe Dates, an adolescent dating violence prevention program. *American Journal of Public Health*, 88(1), 45–50.
- Foshee, V., Fothergill, K., & Stuart, J. (1992). *Results from the Teenage Dating Abuse Study in Githens Middle School and Southern High School*. Unpublished manuscript, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Foshee, V. A., Linder, F., & Bauman, K. E. (1996). The Sage Dates Project: Theoretical basis, evaluation design, and selected baseline findings. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 12(5 Suppl.), 39–47.
- Frankel, F., & Weiner, H. (1990). The Child Conflict Index: Factor analysis, reliability, and validity for clinic-referred and nonreferred children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 19(3), 239–248.
- Frankel, F., & Myatt, R. (1994). A dimensional approach to the assessment of social competence in boys. *Psychological Assessment*, 6(3), 249–254.
- Freiberg, J., Stein, T., Waxman, H. C., & Wang, M. C. (1992). *The School Climate Survey for Teachers*. Houston, TX: Center for Education in the Inner Cities.
- Fryxell, D. R. K. (1997). *Risk factors associated with chronic anger, hostility, and aggression in preadolescent youth*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii, Honolulu.
- Fuqua, D. R., Leonard, E., Masters, M. A., Smith, R. J., Campbell, J. L., & Fischer, P. C. (1991). A structural analysis of the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 51, 439–446.
- Furlong, M., Babinski, L., & Poland, S. (1994, March). *School psychologists respond to school violence: A national survey*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists.
- Furlong, M. J., & Smith, D. C. (1998). Raging Rick to tranquil Tom: An empirically based multidimensional anger typology for adolescent males. *Psychology in the Schools*, 35(3), 229–245.
- Gaba, R. J. (1966). *Psychometric properties of the Survey of Children's Exposure to Community Violence: Screening Version*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, School of Psychology, Pasadena, CA.
- Gabriel, R. M., Hopson, T., Haskins, M., & Powell, K. E. (1996). Building relationships and resilience in the prevention of youth violence. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 12(5 Suppl.), 48–55.
- Gladstein, J., Rusonis, E. J. S., & Heald, F. P. (1992). A comparison of inner-city and upper-

- middle class youths' exposure to violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 13(4), 275–280.
- Gladue, B. A. (1991a). Aggressive behavior characteristics, hormones, and sexual orientation in men and women. *Aggressive Behavior*, 17, 313–326.
- Gladue, B. A. (1991b). Qualitative and quantitative sex differences in self-reported aggressive behavioral characteristics. *Psychological Reports*, 68(2), 675–684.
- Glow, R. A., Glow, P. A., & Rump, E. E. (1982). The stability of child behavior disorders: A one year test-retest study of Adelaide versions of the Conners' Teacher and Parent Rating Scales. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 10, 36–60.
- Gottfredson, G. D., & Gottfredson, D. C. (1996). *A national study of delinquency prevention in school*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Greene, V. R. (1995). *The relationships among exposure to violence and crime, perceptions of vulnerability to harm or death, and risk behaviors in adolescents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego.
- Gresham, F. K., & Elliott, S. N. (1990). *Social Skills Rating System Manual*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.
- Grossnickle, D. R., Bialk, T. J., & Panagiotaros, B. C. (1993). The School Discipline Climate Survey: Toward a safe, orderly learning environment. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77(556), 60–69.
- Guevara, M.V. (1991). *Exposure to gang violence and the development of posttraumatic stress disorder in continuation school youth*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA.
- Gunn, J., & Gristwood, J. (1975). Use of the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory among British prisoners. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 43(4), 590.
- Haapasalo, J., & Tremblay, R. E. (1994). Physically aggressive boys from ages 6 to 12: Family background, parenting behavior, and prediction of delinquency. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62(5), 1044–1052.
- Harper, E. (1983). *Behavioral ratings assigned to emotionally disturbed children by public and/or private school teachers and by psychiatric hospital teachers on the School Behavior Checklist, Form A2*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Duke University, Chapel Hill, NC.
- Hightower, A. D., Work, W. C., Cowen, E. L., Lotyczewski, B. S., Spinell, A. P., Guare, J. C., & Rohrbeck, C. (1986). The Teacher-Child Ratings Scale: A brief objective measure of elementary children's school problem behaviors and competencies. *School Psychology Review*, 15(3), 393–409.

- Hill, S. C. (1997). *School-related violence: A secondary analysis of the Youth Risk Behavior Survey data (1993 and 1995)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Carbondale, IL.
- Holland, T. R., Levi, M., & Beckett, G. E., (1983). Ethnicity, criminality, and the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 47(4), 375–379.
- Horowitz, K., Weine, S., & Jekel, J. (1995). PTSD symptoms in urban adolescent girls: Compounded community trauma. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 34(10), 1353–1361.
- Howell, A. J., Reddon, J. R., & Enns, R. A. (1997). Immediate antecedents to adolescents' offenses. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 53(4), 355–360.
- Huesmann, L. R., Eron, L. D., & Guerra, N. G. (1992). *Victimization and aggression*. Philadelphia: Society for Life History Research.
- Huesmann, L. R., Eron, L. D., Guerra, N. G., & Crawshaw, V. B. (1994). Measuring children's aggression with teachers' predictions of peer nominations. *Psychological Assessment*, 6(4), 329–336.
- Huesmann, L. R., Eron, L. D., Lefkowitz, M. M., & Walder, L. O. (1984). Stability of aggression over time and generations. *Developmental Psychology*, 20(6), 1120–1134.
- Huesmann, L. R., Guerra, N. G., Zelli, A., & Miller, A. (1992). Differing normative beliefs about aggression for boys and girls. In K. Bjorkqvist & N. Pirkko (Eds.), *Of mice and women: Aspects of female aggression* (pp. 77–78). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Huizinga, D., Esbensen, F. A., & Weiher, A. W. (1991). Are there multiple paths to delinquency? *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 82, 83–118.
- Humphrey, L. L. (1982). Children's and teacher's perspectives on children's self-control: The development of two ratings scales. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 50(5), 624–633.
- Hutton, J. B., & Roberts, T. (1983). Factor structure of problem behavior for mildly handicapped and non-handicapped students. *Psychological Reports*, 52, 703–707.
- Jentzsch, C. E., & Merrell, K. W. (1996). An investigation of the construct validity of the Preschool Kindergarten Behavior Scales. *Diagnostic*, 21(2), 1–15.
- Johnston, C., Pelham, W. E., Crawford, J. J., & Atkins, M. S. (1988). A psychometric study of positive and negative nominations and the Pupil Evaluation Inventory. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 16(6), 617–626.

- Kann, L., Warren, C. W., Harris, W. A., Collins, J. L., Williams, B. I., Ross, J. G., & Kolbe, L. J. (1997). Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance—United States, 1995. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 45(SS-4), 1–83.
- Kaplan, H. B. (1985). A comparison of the Vane Kindergarten Test with the WPPSI and a measure of self-control. *Psychology in the Schools*, 22, 277–282.
- Kazdin, A. E., French, N. H., Unis, A. S., Esveldt-Dawson, K., & Sherick, R. B. (1983). Hopelessness, depression, and suicidal intent among psychiatrically disturbed inpatient children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 51(4), 504–510.
- Kazdin, A. E., Rodgers, A., & Colbus, D. (1986). The Hopelessness Scale for psychometric characteristics and concurrent validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 54(2), 241–245.
- Keane, T. M., Malloy, P. F., & Fairbank, J. A. (1984). Empirical development of an MMPI subscale for the assessment of combat-related posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 52, 888–891.
- Keenan, P. A., & Lachar, D. (1988). Screening preschoolers with special problems: Use of the Personality Inventory for Children (PIC). *Journal of School Psychology*, 26, 1–11.
- Kendall, P., & Wilcox, L. (1979). Self-control in children: Development of a rating scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 47, 1020–1029.
- Kennedy, E. (1993). *Social-cognitive correlates of aggression and victimization in childhood*. Unpublished master's thesis, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton.
- Kidd-Burton, S. J. (1996). *Relationship between violent experiences and discipline problems in school*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Illinois State University, Normal.
- Kingery, P. M. (1998). The Adolescent Violence Survey: A psychometric analysis. *School Psychology International*, 19, 31–47.
- Kingery, P., Minogue, N., Murphy, L., & Coggeshall, M. (1998a). *National School Crime and Safety Survey: Staff Form*. Unpublished survey, Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence, Rosslyn, VA.
- Kingery, P., Minogue, N., Murphy, L., & Coggeshall, M. (1998b). *The National School Crime and Safety Survey: Student Form*. Rosslyn, VA: Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence.
- Kline, R. B. (1994). New objective rating scales for child assessment, I. Parent- and Teacher Informant Inventories of the Behavior Assessment System for Children: The Child

- Behavior Checklist and the Teacher Report Form. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 12(3).
- Kline, R.B., Lachar, D. & Gdowski, C.L. (1992). Clinical validity of a Personality Inventory for Children (PIC) typology. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 58, 591-605.
- Knapp, M. J. (1996). *Violence prevention strategy use and perceived effectiveness in Kansas high schools: A survey of building administrators (principals)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, Manhattan.
- Koel, E. (1992). *Sexually abused boys: Sexual confusion and aggression (child abuse, behavior)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego, CA.
- Kolbe, L. J., Kann, L. & Collins, J. L. (1993). The Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System. *Public Health Reports*, 108(1), 2-10.
- Korn, M. L., Botsis, A. J., Kotler, M., Plutchik, R., Conte, H. R., Finkelstein, G., Grosz, D., Kay, S., Brown, S., & van Praag, H. M. (1992). The Suicide and Aggression Survey: A semistructured instrument for the measurement of suicidality and aggression. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 33(6), 359-365.
- Krajewski, S. S., Rybarik, M., Dosch, M. F., & Gilmore, G. D. (1996). Results of a curriculum intervention with seventh graders regarding violence in relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, 11(2), 93-112.
- Kroner, D. G., & Reddon, J. R. (1992). The Anger Expression Scale and State-Trait Anger Scale: Stability, reliability, and factor structure in an inmate sample. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 19(4), 397-408.
- Lachar, D. (1982). *The Personality Inventory for Children*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Lachar, D., & Gdowski, C. L. (1979). Problem-behavior factor correlates of Personality Inventory for Children profile scales. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 47(1), 39-48.
- Lachar, D., Gdowski, C. L., & Snyder, D. K. (1982). Broad-based dimensions of psychopathology: Factor scales for the Personality Inventory for Children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 50(5), 634-642.
- Lachar, D., Gdowski, C. L., & Snyder, D. K. (1984). External validation of the Personality Inventory for Children (PIC) Profile and Factor Scales: Parent, teacher, and clinician ratings. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 52(2), 155-164.

- Lacher, D., & Gruber, C. P. (1995). *Personality Inventory for Youth (PIY) Manual: Technical Guide*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Lam, J. A. (1989). *School mediation evaluation kit*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Office.
- Larson, J. (1993). School psychologists' perceptions of physically aggressive student behavior as a referral concern in nonurban districts. *Psychology in the Schools*, 30(4), 345–350.
- Larson, J. (1997). *Aggressive Behavior in Schools Survey*. (Available from J. Larson, Ph.D., University of Wisconsin Whitewater, 800 W. Main St., Whitewater, WI 53190.)
- Ledingham, J. E. (1981). Developmental patterns of aggressive and withdrawn behavior in childhood: A possible method for identifying preschizophrenics. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 9, 1–22.
- Ledingham, J. E., Younger, A., Schwartzman, A., & Bergeron, G. (1982). Agreement among teacher, peer, and self-ratings of children's aggression, withdrawal, and likability. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 10(3), 363–372.
- Lennings, C. J. (1991). A modification of the Kendall Wilcox Self-Control Scale for delinquents. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 35(1), 83–91.
- Loeber, R., & Dishion, T. J. (1983). Early predictors of male delinquency: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 94, 68–94.
- Loney, L., & Milich, R. (1982). Hyperactivity, inattention, and aggression in clinical practice. In M. Wolraich & D.K. Routh (Eds.), *Advances in Behavioral Pediatrics* (pp. 113-147). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Matheny, K. B., Currence, W. L., Aycok, D. W., Pugh, J. L., & Taylor, H. F. (1987). *The Coping Resources Inventory for Stress*. Atlanta, GA: Health Prisms.
- McConaughy, S. H., Mattison, R. E., & Peterson, R. L. (1994). Behavioral/emotional problems of children with serious emotional disturbances and learning disabilities. *School Psychology Review*, 23, 77–94.
- McGee, R., Williams, S., Bradshaw, J., Chapel, J. L., Robins, A., & Silva, P. A. (1983). The Rutter Scale for completion by teachers: Factor structure and relationships with cognitive abilities and family adversity for a sample of New Zealand children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 26(5), 727–739.
- McIntosh, R., & Vaughn, S. (1993, April). *Peer ratings of aggression: Relation to social skills, behavior problems, and friendships*. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

- Merrell, K. W. (1993a). *School Social Behavior Scales test manual*. Brandon, VT: Clinical Psychology Publishing Company.
- Merrell, K. W. (1993b). Using behavior rating scales to assess social skills and antisocial behavior in school settings: Development of the School Social Behavior Scales. *School Psychology Review*, 22(1), 115–133.
- Merrell, K. W. (1994). *Preschool and Kindergarten Behavior Scales*. Brandon, VT: Clinical Psychology Publishing Company.
- Merrell, K. W. (1996a). Social-emotional assessment in early childhood: The Preschool and Kindergarten Behavior Scales. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 20(2), 132–145.
- Merrell, K. W. (1996b). Social-emotional problems in early childhood: New directions in conceptualization, assessment, and treatment. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 19(4), 458–473.
- Merrell, K. W., Cedeno, C. J., & Johnson, E. R. (1993). The relationship between social behavior and self-concept in school settings. *Psychology in the Schools*, 30, 293–298.
- Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. (1993). *The Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher*. New York: Author.
- Miller, L. C. (1967). Louisville Behavior Checklist for males, 6-12 years of age. *Psychological Reports*, 21, 885–886.
- Miller, L. C. (1972). School Behavior Checklist: An inventory of deviant behavior for elementary school children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 38(1), 134–144.
- Miller, L. C. (1977). *School Behavior Checklist*. Louisville, KY: University of Louisville.
- Miller, L. C. (1980). Dimensions of adolescent psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 8(2), 161–173.
- Miller, L. C. (1984). *Louisville Behavior Checklist (Revised)*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Miller, L. C., Barrett, C. L., Hampe, E., & Noble, H. (1971). Revised Anxiety Scales for the Louisville Behavior Check List. *Psychological Reports*, 29, 503–511.
- Miller, L., Hampe, E., Barrett, C. L., & Noble, H. (1972). Test-retest reliability of parent ratings of children's deviant behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 31, 249–250.
- Miller, L. C., & Roid, G. H. (1988). Factor-analytically derived scales for the Louisville Behavior

- Checklist. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 56(2), 302–304.
- Miller, L. S., Klein, R. G., Piacentini, J., Abikoff, H., Shah, M. R., Samoliov, A., & Guardino, M. (1995). The New York Teacher Rating Scale for disruptive and antisocial behavior. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 34(3), 359–370.
- Morrison, S. D., Chaffin, S. & Chase, T. V. (1975). Aggression in adolescents: Use of the Buss-Durkee Inventory. *Southern Medical Journal*, 68, 431–436.
- Myles, B. S., & Simpson, R. L. (1994). Understanding and preventing acts of aggression and violence in school-age children and youth. *The Clearing House*, 38(3), 40–46.
- Nadel, H., Spellmann, M., Alvarez-Canino, T., Lusell-Bryant, L., & Landsberg, G. (1996). The cycle of violence and victimization: A study of the school-based intervention of a multidisciplinary youth violence prevention program. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 12(5 Suppl.), 109–119.
- National Institute of Education. (1978). *Violent schools—safe schools: The Safe School Study Report to Congress*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Neary, A., & Joseph, S. (1994). Peer victimization and its relationship to self-concept and depression among schoolchildren. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 16, 183–186.
- Needleman, H. L., Riess, J. A., Tobin, M. J., Biesecker, G. E., & Greenhouse, J. B. (1996). Bone lead levels and delinquent behavior. *Journal of the American Academy of Medicine*, 275(5), 363–369.
- Nelson, D. E., Higginson, G. K., & Grant-Worley, J. A. (1994). Using the Youth Risk Behavior Survey to estimate prevalence of sexual abuse among Oregon high school students. *Journal of School Health*, 64(10), 413–418.
- Olweus, D. (1977). Aggression and peer acceptance in adolescent boys: Two short-term longitudinal studies of ratings. *Child Development*, 48, 1301–1313.
- Pekarik, E. G., Prinz, R. J., Liebert, D. E., Weintraub, S., & Neale, J. (1976). The Pupil Evaluation Inventory: A sociometric technique for assessing children's social behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 4, 83–87.
- Perkins, D. D., Florin, P., Rich, R. C., Wandesman, A., & Chavis, D. M. (1990). Participation and the social and physical environment of residential blocks: Crime and community context. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18(1), 83–115.
- Phillips, J., & Springer F. (1992). *Extended National Youth Sports Program 1991–92 evaluation highlights, Part two: Individual Protective Factors Index (IPFI) and risk assessment study*. Unpublished report prepared for the National Collegiate Athletic Association,

- Sacramento, CA: EMT Associates.
- Price, J. H., & Everett, S. A. (1997). A national assessment of secondary school principals' perceptions of violence in schools. *Health Education and Behavior*, 24(2), 218–229.
- Prilik, P. K. (1966). *The relationship between adolescent exposure to domestic and community violence and principled moral judgment reasoning (domestic violence)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Adelphi University, School of Social Work, Garden City, NY.
- Pynoos, R. S., & Eth, S. (1986). Witness to violence: The child interview. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 25 (3), 306–319.
- Rahdert, E. R. (1991). *The adolescent assessment/referral system manual*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration.
- Rauste-von Wright, M. (1989). Physical and verbal aggression in peer groups among Finnish boys and girls. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 12(4), 473–484.
- Renson, G. J., Adams, J. E., & Tinklenberg, F. R. (1978). Buss-Durkee Assessment and validation with violent versus nonviolent chronic alcohol abusers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46(2), 360–361.
- Reynolds, C. R., & Kamphaus, R. W. (1992). *Behavior Assessment System for Children*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.
- Richters, J. E. (1990). *Screening survey of exposure to violence: Self-report version*. Unpublished report, National Institutes of Mental Health, Rockville, MD.
- Richters, J. E., & Martinez, P. (1990). *Things I Have Seen and Heard: A structured interview for assessing young children's violence exposure*. Unpublished paper. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Mental Health.
- Riley, W., & Treiber, F. A. (1989). The validity of multidimensional self-report anger and hostility measures. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 45(3), 397.
- Robin, A. L., Fischel, J. E., & Brown, K. E. (1984). The measurement of self-control in children: Validation of the Self-Control Ratings Scale. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 9(2), 165–175.
- Rogers, A. B. (1988). *The development and evaluation of a violence prevention program for secondary schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University, Atlanta, p. 304.
- Rohrbeck, C. A., Azar, S. T., & Wagner, P. E. (1991). Child Self-Control Rating Scale:

- Validation of a child self-report measure. *Journal of Clinical Child psychology*, 20(2), 179–183.
- Rosenfeld, E., Huesmann, L. R., Eron, L. D., & Torney-Purta, J. V. (1982). Measuring patterns of fantasy behavior in children. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42(2), 347–366.
- Rubenstein, G. (1975). *Peer Rating Scale*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Rutter, M. (1967). A children's behavior questionnaire for completion by teachers: Preliminary findings. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 8, 1–11.
- Sandoval, J., & Echandia, A. (1994). Behavior Assessment System for Children. *Journal of School Psychology*, 32(4), 419–425.
- Seguin, J. R., Pihl, R. O., Harden, P. W., Tremblay, R. E., & Boulerice, B. (1995). Cognitive and neuropsychology characteristics of physically aggressive boys. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 104(4), 614–624.
- Shapiro, J. P., Dorman, R. L., Burkey, W. M., Welker, C. J., & Clough, J. B. (1997). Development and factor analysis of a measure of youth attitudes toward guns and violence. *Journal of clinical child psychology*, 26(3), 311.
- Shapiro, J. P., Dorman, R. L., Welker, C., & Clough, J. B. (1998). Youth attitudes towards guns and violence: Relations with sex, age, ethnic group, and firearm exposure. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 27(1), 98–108.
- Sheley, J. F., & Wright, J. D. (1995). *Tulane University National Youth Study*. New Orleans, LA: Tulane University.
- Siegel, J. M. (1984). Anger and cardiovascular risk in adolescents. *Health Psychology*, 3(4), 293–313.
- Siegel, J. M. (1986). The Multidimensional Anger Inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(1), 191–200.
- Siegel, J. M. (1992). Anger and cardiovascular health. In H.S. Friedman (Ed.), *Hostility, coping & health* (pp. 49-64). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Siegel, J. M., Matthews, K. A., & Leitch, C. J. (1981). Validation of the Type A Interview Assessment of Adolescents: A multidimensional approach. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 43(4), 311–321.
- Sines, J. O. (1985). *Missouri Children's Behavior Checklist (Form P)*. Iowa City, IO: University of Iowa.

- Slaby, R. G. (1989). *An evaluation of a violence prevention program: Health promotion for urban youth*. Unpublished manuscript, Education Development Center, Inc., Newton, MA.
- Slaby, R. G., & Guerra, N. G. (1988). Cognitive mediators of aggression in adolescent offenders: 1. Assessment. *Developmental Psychology*, 24, 580–588.
- Smith, D. C., Adelman, H. S., Nelson, P., & Taylor, L. (1988). Anger, perceived control and school behavior among students with learning problems. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 29, 517–522.
- Smith, D. C., Furlong, M., Bates, M., & Laughlin, J. D. (1998). Development of the Multidimensional School Anger Inventory for Males. *Psychology in the Schools*, 35(1), 1–15.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1988a). Anger Expression Scale. In M. Hersen & A. S. Bellack (Eds.), *Dictionary of Behavioral Assessment Techniques*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1988b). *Manual for the State-Trait Anger Expression Scale (STAX)*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1988c). *State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory: Research Edition*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Spielberger, C. D., Krasner, S. S., & Solomon, E. P. (Eds.). (1988). The experience, expression, and control of anger. In M. A. Chesney and R. H. Rosenman (Eds.), *Anger and hostility in cardiovascular and behavioral disorders*. New York: Hemisphere/McGraw-Hill.
- Sprague, J., Colvin, G., & Irvin, L. (1995). *The Oregon School Safety Survey (OSSS)*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.
- Stein, A., Lewis, D. O., & Yeager, C. (1993). The Juvenile Justice Assessment Instrument. *Juvenile & Family Court Journal*, 44(3), 91–102.
- Stickel, S. A., Satchwell, K. M., & Meyer, E. C. (1991). The school counselor and discipline: A three-state survey. *School Counselor*, 39(2), 111–115.
- Stormont-Spurgin, M., & Zentall, S. S. (1995). Contributing factors in the manifestation of aggression in preschoolers with hyperactivity. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 36(3), 491–509.
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Finkelhor, D., Moore, D., & Runyan, D. (1998). Identification of child maltreatment with the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scales: Development and psychometrics data for a national sample of American parents. *Child Abuse & Neglect*,

22(4), 249–270.

- Tellegen, A. (1982). *Brief manual for the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire*. N. P.: Author.
- Thurber, S., Hollingsworth, D. K., & Miller, L. A. (1996). The Hopelessness Scale for Children: Psychometric properties with hospitalized adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 52(5), 543–545.
- Treiber, F. A., Musante, L., Riley, W., Mabe, P. A., Car, T., Levy, M., Strong, W. B. (1989). The relationship between hostility and blood pressure in children. *Behavioral Medicine*, 15, 173–178.
- Tremblay, R. E., Desmarais-Gervais, L., Gagnon, C., & Charlebois, P. (1987). The Preschool Behaviour Questionnaire: Stability of its structure between cultures, sexes, ages and socioeconomic classes. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 10(4), 467–484.
- Tremblay, R.E., Loeber, R., Gagnon, C., Charlebois, P., Larivee, S., & LeBlanc, M. (1991). Disruptive boys with stable and unstable high fighting behavior patterns during junior elementary school. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 19, 285–300.
- Tremblay, R. E., Vitaro, F., Gagnon, C., Piche, C., & Royer, N. (1992). A Prosocial Scale for the Preschool Behaviour Questionnaire: Concurrent and predictable correlates. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 15(2), 227–245.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (1994). *Schools and staffing survey, 1990–1991*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. (1996). *Recommendations of the Crime, Violence, and Discipline Reporting Task Force*, NCES 97-581, prepared by the National Education Statistics Agenda Committee: 1996.
- U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1997). *1995 National Youth Gang Survey: Summary report*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Ullmann, R. K., Sleator, E. K., & Sprague, R. L. (1985). A change of mind: The Conners' Abbreviated Rating Scales reconsidered. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 13, 553–565.
- Valois, R. F., McKeown, R. E., Garrison, C. Z., & Vincent, M. L. (1995). Correlates of aggressive and violent behaviors among public high school adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 16(1), 26–34.

- Van Der Ploeg, H. M. (1988). The factor structure of the State-Trait Anger Scale. *Psychological Reports*, 63, 978.
- Venables, P. H., Fletcher, R. P., Dalais, J. C., Mitchell, D. A., Schulsinger, F., & Mednick, S. A. (1983). Factor structure of the Rutter Children's Behaviour Questionnaire in a primary school population in a developing country. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 24(2), 213–222.
- Walder, L. O., Abelson, R. P., Eron, L. D., Banta, T. J., & Laulicht, J. H. (1961). Development of a peer-rating measure of aggression. *Psychological Reports*, 9, 497–556.
- Walker, H. M., & McConnell, S. R. (1988). *The Walker-McConnell Scale of Social Competence and School Adjustment: A social skills rating scale for teachers*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Walsh, M. (1995). *The relationship of exposure to community violence with posttraumatic stress disorder and expression of anger in adolescents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, New York.
- Warren, S. L., Oppenheim, D., & Emde, R. N. (1996). Can emotions and themes in children's play predict behavior problems? *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 35(10), 1331–1337.
- Wehmeyer, M. L., & Palmer, S. B. (1998). Factor structure and construct validity of scores on the Hopelessness Scale for Children with students with cognitive disabilities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 58(4), 661–667.
- Weinberger, D. A., & Schwartz, G. E. (1990). *Distress and restraint as superordinate dimensions of adjustment: A typological perspective*. *Journal of Personality*, 58(2), 381–417.
- Weine, A. M., Phillips, J. S., & Achenbach, T. M. (1995). Behavioral and emotional problems among Chinese and American children: Parent and teacher reports for ages 6 to 13. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 23(5), 619–630.
- Weintraub, S., Prinz, R. J., & Neale, J. M. (1978). Peer evaluations of the competence of children vulnerable to psychopathology. *Journal of Child Psychology*, 6, 461–473.
- Williams, T., & Batten, M. (1981). *The quality of school life*. Hawthorn, Victoria, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Wirt, R.D., Lachar, D., Klinedinst, J. K., & Seat, P. D. (1984). *Multidimensional description of child personality: A manual for the Personality Inventory for Children*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Wirt, R. D., Lachar, D., Klinedinst, J. K., & Seat, P. D. (1997). *Multidimensional evaluation of*

- child personality: A manual for the Personality Inventory for Children*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Wolfe, D. A., Reitzel-Jaffe, D., Gough, R., & Wekerle, C. (1994). *Conflicts in relationships: Measuring physical and sexual coercion among youth*. London, ON: The University of Western Ontario.
- Worthen, B. R., Borg, W. R., & White, K. R. (1993). *Measurement and evaluation in the classroom*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Wrobel, N. H., & Lachar, D. (1998). Validity of self- and parent-report scales in screening students for behavioral and emotional problems in elementary school. *Psychology in the Schools*, 5(1), 17–27.
- Yodofsky, S. C., Silver, J. M., Jackson, W., Endicott, J., & Williams, D. (1986). The Overt Aggression Scale for the objective rating of verbal and physical aggression. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 143(1), 35–39.
- Younger, A. J., Schwartzman, A. E., & Ledingham, J. E. (1985). Age-related changes in children's perceptions of aggression and withdrawal in their peers. *Developmental Psychology*, 21(1), 70–75.
- Zucca-Brown, S. (1997). *An elementary school mediation program: Its effects on student mediators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia.